

Solicitors' Journal & Reporter.

LONDON, NOVEMBER 9, 1878.

CONTENTS.

JOURNAL.

CURRENT TOPICS:—

| | |
|---|----|
| New Benchers of Lincoln's Inn | 21 |
| The Recent Bar Examinations | 21 |
| The Right to the Exclusive Use of a Name for a House | 21 |
| The Debtors Act, 1869 | 21 |
| The New Rules for Judges' Chambers | 21 |
| Judicial Dignity | 22 |
| Applications for New Trials on the Ground of Misdirection | 22 |
| LEADERS:— | |
| The Lord Chief Justice and Lord Penzance | 22 |
| The New Bills of Sale Act | 22 |
| REVIEWS | 24 |
| GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE | 25 |
| NEW ORDERS, ETC. | 26 |
| CASES OF THE WEEK | 27 |
| SOCIETIES | 28 |
| LEGAL NEWS | 29 |
| LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL | 29 |
| COURT PAPERS | 30 |
| LONDON GAZETTE, &c., &c. | 33 |

NOTES OF CASES.

| | |
|--|----|
| Hankin v. Turner | 27 |
| Re Marley's Trade-Mark | 27 |
| Bartholomew Hospital v. Phillips | 27 |
| General Finance Mortgage Company v. Liberator Benefit Building Society | 27 |

REPORTS.

| | |
|---|----|
| Adams, In re. Ex parte Cully (App.) | 28 |
| Bailey v. Robertson and anr. (H.L.) | 17 |
| Charles v. Taylor, Walker, & Co. (App.) | 32 |
| Green v. Tribe (Ch.Div. Fry J.) | 39 |
| Hankin v. Turner. In re Ivory (App.) | 20 |
| Horne Bay Waterworks Company Re The (Ch.Div. V.C.M.) | 36 |
| Hodgson, Re. Hodgson v. Fox (Ch.Div. V.C.J.) | 38 |
| "Jane Bacon," The (App.) | 35 |
| Jones v. Robinson (C.P.Div.) | 48 |
| Forsters and others v. Watney and others (App.) | 50 |
| Queen, The, on the Prosecution of Baker, Respondent; The Spon Lane Colliery Company, Limited, Appellants (Q.B.Div.) | 46 |
| Robinson v. The Maharajah Duleep Singh (App.) | 41 |
| Smith v. Whetstone (Ch.Div. Fry, J.) | 42 |
| Westbourne-grove Drapery Company, In re The (Ch.Div. V.C.B.) | 37 |
| Wormsley, In re. Baines v. Wormsley (Ch.Div. M.R.) | 36 |

TO CORRESPONDENTS.—All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer. The Editor cannot undertake to return MSS. forwarded to him.

Notes for the Ensuing Week.

| |
|--|
| November 11.—Half Quarter Day. |
| " 12.—Sheriffs nominated. |
| " 15.—Solicitors' Certificates expire. |

CURRENT TOPICS.

MR. HENRY BRET INCH, Q.C., and Mr. Horace Davey, Q.C., have been elected Benchers of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn.

THE RESULTS of the recent Michaelmas Term Examinations for Pass and in Roman Law at the Inns of Court, we understand are considered to compare, on the whole, rather favourably with former examinations. The number of the candidates rejected in the Pass Examination is still large, but in Roman Law it is greatly below the average; giving evidence of the growing success of the scheme which bribes the student to throw all his energies at first into the acquisition of knowledge which he will afterwards be at liberty entirely to dispense with.

IT USED TO BE SAID that an Englishman's house was his castle; but the satisfaction with which the

Englishman regards this doctrine will be considerably lessened when he knows that he may not call his castle by any name he likes. Vice-Chancellor Malins thinks that "there can be no doubt whatever that having two adjoining [*i.e.*, neighbouring] houses called by the same name must of necessity cause the greatest annoyance, and [his lordship added, with much exactness, if less originality] there were many cases in which the court would interfere to prevent a man from being annoyed by his neighbours, such as the nuisance arising from intolerable noises and noxious smells;" and the Vice-Chancellor proceeded to overrule a demurrer to a statement of claim praying an injunction to restrain the defendant from calling his house by the same name as the plaintiff's house. We do not comment on a case which is yet to be heard, but we may be permitted to remark that if we are to understand the Vice-Chancellor as laying down the rule that there may be such a thing as an exclusive property in the name of a house, the doctrine appears to be novel, and is, moreover, attended with this rather singular consequence—that a man may have a right to the exclusive use of a name for his house, while he has no right (except in connection with a trade or business) to the exclusive use of his own name. For, as Lord Chelmsford said in *Du Boulay v. Du Boulay* (L. R. 2 P. C. 420), "in this country we do not recognize the absolute right of a person to a particular name to the extent of entitling him to prevent the assumption of that name by a stranger. . . . The mere assumption of a name which is the patronymic of a family by a stranger who had never before been called by that name, whatever cause of annoyance it may be to the family, is a grievance for which the law affords no redress."

THE DEBTORS ACT of last session received an interpretation in a case of *Mitchell v. Malings*, before Vice-Chancellor Hall, on Wednesday. An application was made on motion before the Vice-Chancellor for the discharge from prison of a defendant who had been attached in January last for contempt in not paying into court a sum due from him as trustee. On the part of the applicant it was urged that he had no possible prospect of being able to pay the money, and it was shown by medical certificates that his health was suffering and would suffer by further confinement, and it was useless to detain him any longer. For the plaintiff it was contended (1) that the court had no jurisdiction to release the prisoner, the order for committal for contempt having been made before the Act came into operation; (2) that, if there was jurisdiction, the time to exercise it had not arrived. The Vice-Chancellor, on the 4th of November, directed the case to stand over, in order that examination might be made and evidence produced to him as to the ability of the prisoner to pay, and generally as to his means; and this evidence having been produced, the learned judge, on the 6th inst., gave judgment releasing the prisoner, on the ground that he was wholly unable to pay. On the point of jurisdiction, the learned Vice-Chancellor had no doubt that he had jurisdiction, for, as the new Act is to be construed as one with the Debtors Act, 1869, it is part and parcel of that Act, and applies to any prisoner now in gaol, at whatever time the order of committal may have been made.

THE NEW RULES for the conduct of business at judges' chambers, which will be found in another column, follow closely the recommendations made by the committee of judges in the report issued in June last. They are, however, confined for the present to the business before the judge; the order of business before the master remains as before. The remark made by the judges in their report as to the loss to the revenue occasioned by persons who use affidavits

in chambers taking them away in order to save the fee for filing them, has been embodied in a definite rule that "no affidavit used at chambers shall be taken away without the express leave of the judge or master; but the same shall be delivered, duly stamped, to the door-keeper to be filed, whose duty it shall be to see that this order is complied with." The mysterious "John" (who, according to one of the witnesses before the Legal Offices Committee, always used to take charge of affidavits in the Exchequer) will now, therefore, have legitimate successors. There is also a new provision that *ex parte* applications to the judge shall be heard at the close of the day, unless convenient intervals shall occur during the earlier hours. We shall see next week how the new provisions work.

THE AMERICAN legal journals are making merry over a little mistake of the *Chicago Legal News*. That patriotic organ recently took exception to a remark we made some time ago as to the mode in which the majesty of the law was stated to be personified in a certain American court, and read us a lecture on the dignity of the American courts; but, unfortunately, in the very next article, furnished a remarkable confirmation of our observation. We grieve to say that, owing either to inattention or the non-arrival of the copy of the *Chicago Legal News*, the lecture was lost upon us, and we only heard of it through this week's files of the American and Canadian journals. The *Albany Law Journal* says:—

We are afraid our excellent contemporary, the *Chicago Legal News*, has 'put its foot in it.' The *SOLICITORS' JOURNAL* having innocently said something about its being difficult for the 'popular mind to grasp the idea of the majesty of the law as personified, for instance, in the American court, which, according to the description of a recent writer, consists of "an elderly gentleman, sitting on a cane bottomed chair and expectorating thoughtfully," the *Legal News* reads 'our learned and respected contemporary' a lecture, and informs it among other things that, 'There is no country in the world where the judges of inferior courts of record preside with more dignity and indulge in less wrangles with attorneys, and are more respected by the bar and people, than in America.' This is all well enough, if it be true, and it ought to be; but we doubt if it will have its due weight on the mind of 'our learned and respected contemporary,' for in the very next article in the *Legal News*, we are given an account of 'professional etiquette on the frontier,' wherein is stated the cause of the great unpopularity of Judge Beck, 'Judge of Wyoming.' We quote:—

"He even carried his whim of professional propriety so far as to prohibit swearing in court, and is said to have fined a lawyer who swore at a witness during his cross-examination. Another peculiarity of this judge is a dislike of seeing attorneys, when arguing a case before him, pass around a bottle of whisky, and he is said to be violently opposed to lawyers treating the jury to 'drinks' while a trial is in progress. Judge Beck is said to have violated common decency by refusing to proceed with a case until the attorneys engaged in it should put out their pipes; and a community once aroused in indignation when he ordered a lawyer to remove his feet from the judge's desk."

"This was all, no doubt, very difficult for the 'popular mind' to submit to, but when Judge Beck instructed the grand jury 'to indict every man who indulged in gambling, or sold liquor without a licence, the outraged public demanded his removal.' As is usual under like circumstances in this country, the Legislature was 'seen,' and the result was that a 'Redistricting Act' was passed, and Judge Beck was assigned to a district without 'a town or a court house, and entirely uninhabited, except by military garrisons, Indians, and wild beasts.' The 'popular mind' was thereby satisfied. Of course, Judge Beck was not a 'politician'—a 'machine politician'—or he never would have so run counter to the 'sense of the people'—and this suggests the wonder, how, not being a 'politician,' he got his appointment; but however that may be, the *Legal News* should have remembered that the degenerate foreigner is not up in these matters, and should have kept its lecture and Judge Beck's case apart."

ON MONDAY LAST the Lord Chief Justice took occasion to observe that the announcement he had made on a former occasion as to sittings of the court to hear applications for new trials was that when the application was for misdirection, and the judge who tried the case was a member of the court which heard the case, it would be proper that the court should be constituted of three judges, as otherwise the judge who tried the case would form half the court, and, as he would naturally adhere to his opinion, it might cause an equal division of opinion.

THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE AND LORD PENZANCE.

THE judgment of the Lord Chief Justice of England in *Martin v. Mackonochie*, and of Lord Penzance in *Coombe v. Edwards*, have supplied the appellants and respondents in the appeal pending in the former case with abundant material for criticism and reflection. But it is somewhat singular that both judgments, able and elaborate as they are, assert propositions which neither party will find it easy to maintain in the Court of Appeal. The contention on the part of Mr. Mackonochie, on the one hand, is much narrower than the Chief Justice's reasoning would warrant; whilst Lord Penzance, on the other, claims in effect for the ecclesiastical court an almost absolute immunity from supervision by way of prohibition. For he suggests that no prohibition can go in any case to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and if this be so, it follows that none can effectively go to the Arches Court. It would be, indeed, idle to prohibit the latter if, at the very time the prohibition was issued, the suit could be carried by appeal to a tribunal which could set the prohibition at defiance. That the common law courts were used to prohibit the Court of Delegates, to whose functions the Judicial Committee have succeeded, when they handled matters beyond their jurisdiction, Lord Penzance does not doubt. "Does it follow, however," he asks, "that when this ecclesiastical jurisdiction was transferred by Act of Parliament to a tribunal of the highest dignity, in which the Sovereign (herself signing the judgment) takes a part, this tribunal became at once an inferior court, and subject as such to the writ of prohibition?" We have little doubt that when this question arises it will be answered in the affirmative, and that the Judicial Committee in its character of Court of Appeal from the ecclesiastical courts is simply a part of those courts, and therefore liable to the controlling jurisdiction of the High Court of Justice.

But leaving this important point for discussion on some future occasion, and also passing by the *dicta* of the Lord Chief Justice as to the incompetence of the ecclesiastical court to append a "monition" to a sentence in a penal suit, we think our readers will be glad to know exactly what it is that Mr. Mackonochie's counsel really contended for; and in order that they may appreciate the contention, we must very shortly revert to the facts of the case. Mr. Mackonochie was, on the 7th of November, 1874, pronounced guilty by the Dean of Arches, in a suit sent by letters of request to his court from the Bishop of London, of certain offences against the ceremonial law of the Church, and was sentenced to six weeks' suspension *ab officio*. A monition to him was superadded to desist for the future from the practices thus condemned as unlawful. Mr. Mackonochie submitted to his sentence, but at the close of the six weeks resumed the condemned practices. Thereupon another monition, dated June 12, 1875, was issued in the suit, admonishing him to desist, but of this he took no notice, nor for nearly three years did his antagonist take any notice of him. It was not until March 23, 1878, that application was made by motion to Lord Penzance (who in November, 1875, had succeeded Sir R. Phillimore as Dean

of Arches) to enforce obedience to the monition of June 12, 1875. Being satisfied by affidavit of the defendant's disobedience, Lord Penzance, on March 29, issued a fresh monition to him which was also disobeyed, and thereupon, on May 11, decreed that the defendant had disobeyed the monitions of June 12, 1875, and March 29, 1878, and for his disobedience declared him guilty of contumacy, and "for his conduct aforesaid" sentenced him to be suspended for three years *ab officio et beneficio*. It should be added that the defendant had notice of all the applications to the Arches Court, and, so far, had no cause of complaint. He did not, however, think fit to appear on any of them, but immediately after the last was served upon him applied to the Queen's Bench Division for a prohibition, on the ground that Lord Penzance had exceeded his jurisdiction. The argument which he presented to the court was twofold. The disobedience to the two monitions was, it was said, either a substantive ecclesiastical offence, or was a case of "contumacy" or contempt. If it was to be regarded as the former, clearly there was no jurisdiction, for the Arches Court has no cognizance except by way of appeal or by letters of request of offences committed, as these were, in St. Albans, Holborn, in the diocese of London. If it was to be regarded as the latter, it was equally clear that there was no jurisdiction, for the Arches Court itself cannot enforce execution. That could only be done by the secular court by the compulsory process of contumacy signified and attachment.

It was to the latter alternative that the greater part of the argument in the Queen's Bench was addressed. Mr. Mackonochie's counsel did not attack the validity of the monitions, but confined themselves to insisting that the punishment of suspension for a fixed period for disobedience was wholly *ultra vires*. They challenged the promoter to produce one single instance of such a course having been adopted prior to the recent cases in the Privy Council of *Martin v. Mackonochie* (1st suit, L. R. 3 P. C. 409), and *Hebbert v. Purchas* (L. R. 4 P. C. 301), the authority of which they disputed as being founded upon precedents which were not examined before the Judicial Committee—no counsel having appeared for the defendants—and which would not, they said, bear examination; and of this they succeeded in satisfying the Lord Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Mellor. The Chief Justice has passed these alleged precedents in review in his recent judgment and dismissed them all as worthless. It is worth notice that Lord Penzance, in his long, and in many respects powerful, attack on the judgment, makes no attempt to answer this portion of it.

But even assuming that the sentence is a novelty, and one which ought not to have been pronounced, the principal question still remains whether the matter is one for prohibition. Is it a matter of procedure and practice merely, with which the Court of Arches has authority to deal, subject to an appeal, or is it an excess of jurisdiction? According to the defendant it is the latter, for, treated as a substantive offence, his disobedience to the monition and repetition of the condemned practices had not been brought within the judges' cognizance, either by appeal from the Diocesan Court, or by letters of request, and he had no more power to deal with it than the Court of Appeal at Westminster would have to deal in the first instance with an ordinary action. Or, again, if he be treated as guilty of contumacy, then he points to the invariable practice of the court and insists that his contumacy should have been "signified" to the Court of Chancery, and a writ *de contumacia capiendo* issued under the provisions of 53 Geo. 3, c. 127. This would have led to his arrest, not for a definite period, but only until he should choose to clear himself from contempt (section 1.) Thus he would be, in one sense, the master of the situation, and his benefice meanwhile would remain untouched. Under present circumstances, if he were to submit to-morrow, his three years' punishment would remain

for there is no power in the judge to alter his sentence, at all events without the consent of the promoter.

It is probable that the strong views expressed by the Chief Justice on the absolute illegality of all the monitions will cause the argument in the Court of Appeal to range over a wider field than in the court below, and it may be that the respondent will succeed in supporting the judgment in full. But to justify the conclusion it will not be necessary to do more than to deny the authority of the court to punish contumacy summarily by suspension for a definite time. Of course, if it should be held that there has been no usurpation of jurisdiction, but only the introduction of a novel but authorized form of procedure, the appellant will succeed. The discussion promises to be one of much interest, and it is difficult, with the Lord Chief Justice and Mr. Justice Mellor on one side, and Lord Penzance and Mr. Justice Lush on the other, to form any opinion as to what will be the result. We observe that Lord Penzance endeavours to minimise the value of the Queen's Bench judgment by remarking that the members of the court are necessarily not familiar with ecclesiastical practice and procedure, and the Lord Chief Justice makes a similar remark when dealing with the judgment of the Judicial Committee in *Hebbert v. Purchas*. The Court of Appeal will be open to the same criticism, but we cannot regard it, in a case of this kind, as a disadvantage that the tribunal should be composed of men who will all bring an absolutely open mind to the decision of the questions at issue, which, after all, belong as much to the common and constitutional as to the ecclesiastical law.

THE NEW BILLS OF SALE ACT.

II.

We should add to what we said last week, as to the instruments which need registration, that by section 10 it is provided that a transfer or assignment of a registered bill of sale need not be registered; and by section 11 that no renewal of registration shall become necessary by reason only of a transfer or assignment of a bill of sale.

We come now to the formalities prescribed for the execution and registration of bills of sale. Section 8 provides, in the first place, that every bill of sale to which the Act applies shall be duly attested; and a new mode of attestation is prescribed by section 10, which requires that "the execution of every bill of sale shall be attested by a solicitor of the Supreme Court, and the attestation shall state that before the execution of the bill of sale the effect thereof has been explained to the grantor by the attesting solicitor." It will, of course, be sufficient if the bill of sale is attested by the solicitor only; and this will no doubt come to be the rule, in consequence of the requirement that a description of the residence and occupation of any attesting witness shall be presented to the registrar. It is possible that if rules are made for the purposes of the Act (section 21) a form of attestation may be prescribed, but it is to be observed that the rules are to be made "by the like persons and in the like manner in which rules and regulations may be made under and for the purposes of the Judicature Acts, 1873 and 1875," and it may perhaps be doubted whether any rules will be made.

As to the registration of bills of sale, the most important change to be noticed is the reduction of the time allowed for registration from twenty-one to seven days (section 8). The mode of registration continues practically the same; the bill, with its schedules or inventory, must be presented to the registrar (as required by the Stamp Act, 1870), with a true copy and an affidavit, and he will file the copy and affidavit (section 10).

Section 9 is obviously intended to put an end to the practice, recognized as legal against an execution creditor in *Smale v. Burr* (31 W. R. 193, L. R. 3 C. P.

65) and subsequent cases, of executing within the time allowed for registration a series of unregistered bills of sale for the same debt, of which the last only was registered. It is now provided that "where a subsequent bill of sale is executed within or on the expiration of seven days after the execution of a prior unregistered bill of sale, and comprises all or any part of the personal chattels comprised in such prior bill of sale, then, if such subsequent bill of sale is given as a security for the same debt as is secured by such prior bill of sale, or for any part of such debt, it shall, to the extent to which it is a security for the same debt or part thereof, and so far as respects the personal chattels or part thereof comprised in the prior bill, be absolutely void, unless it is proved to the satisfaction of the court having cognizance of the case that the subsequent bill of sale was *bonâ fide* given for the purpose of correcting some material error in the prior bill of sale, and not for the purpose of evading this Act." It will be observed that the operation of the section is confined to subsequent bills of sale executed within or on the expiration of the seven days; and we are inclined to think that "on" will (as we suggested in a note appended to the letter of an esteemed correspondent some weeks ago) be construed as "immediately upon." Otherwise, the result would follow which was pointed out by our correspondent—viz., that if a man who had taken an unregistered bill of sale for an advance, six months afterwards took a registered bill for the same advance and a further advance, the latter bill would be absolutely void as to the amount included in the unregistered bill. The exception contained in the latter part of the section seems likely to have little operation, for the mode of procedure for correcting an error in a bill of sale is pointed out in the 14th section, which enables the judge to rectify the register, and to extend the time for registration. The Act, by section 15, enables the registrar, instead of the judge, to order a memorandum of satisfaction to be entered on the registered copy of a bill of sale.

Among minor changes which may be noticed are the express provision of section 16 that office copies of bills of sale and affidavits are to be admitted as *primâ facie* evidence; the provision of section 17 that "whoever wilfully makes or uses any false affidavit for the purposes of this Act shall be deemed guilty of wilful and corrupt perjury," and a provision of section 12 that "the index [of the names of grantors] shall be arranged in divisions corresponding with the letters of the alphabet, so that all grantors whose surnames begin with the same letters (and no other) shall be comprised in one division, but the arrangement within each such division need not be strictly alphabetical."

We now come to the new provisions as to the effect of registration. Among these the provision which has given rise to the most discussion is contained in sub-section 4 of section 10, which provides that "in case two or more bills of sale are given, comprising in whole or in part any of the same chattels, they shall have priority in the order of the date of their registration, respectively, as regards such chattels." Hitherto, of course, in the case of two registered bills of sale, the bill which was prior in date had priority. It is obvious that the effect of the new provision will be that, although a person taking a bill of sale in the country may use all due diligence, still delay will necessarily occur, owing to the necessity for using the post and employing a London agent, and although his bill may be registered within the statutory period, he may be postponed to a subsequent bill of sale holder in London who has registered his security on the day on which it was made. This provision seems to point to the completion in London of all bills of sale, except in cases where full confidence exists in the character of the person giving the bill. We shall be curious to see whether the ingenuity of country practitioners will discover some mode of overcoming the difficulty.

Lastly, by way of a further spur to registration, the view of Malins, V.C., in *Ashton v. Blackshaw* (13 W. R. 307, L. R. 9 Eq. 516) is expressly made law by section 20, which provides that "chattels comprised in a bill of sale which has been, and continues to be, duly registered under this Act, shall not be deemed to be in the possession, order, or disposition of the grantor of the bill of sale within the meaning of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869."

Reviews.

PLEADING.

PRECEDENTS OF PLEADING. By JOHN CUNNINGHAM Esq., and MILES WALKER MATTINSON, Esq., Barristers-at-Law. Stevens & Haynes.

The authors of this work observe in their preface that amid the multitude of valuable treatises upon the new practice, no work had been published upon the subject of pleading. As a proof of the continuing necessity for and value of precedents, they adduce the fact that the framers of the Judicature Acts have themselves, in Appendix C, acknowledged this want by essaying in some measure to supply it. We doubt whether the inference which the authors seek to draw from this fact is altogether warranted. It seems to us that the framers of the Acts saw the necessity for giving some specimens of the sort of pleading which the Acts contemplated, but it does not seem to us to follow that the advantage or utility of endeavouring to frame a complete series of precedents applicable to all causes of action is demonstrated by the course they pursued in appending such specimens to the Acts. The present work appears to be intended to supply the place under the new system that such works as Bullen and Leake and Chitty filled under the old system. We do not think it possible that the present work or any that could be written should do this. We think that the work which we are discussing may be of considerable use, but we do not believe in the possibility of "precedents of pleading" under the new system in the sense in which the term was used with regard to the old. Under the old system pleading largely consisted of what were allegations of conclusions of law rather than concrete facts, and it is obvious that the term "precedent" much more properly applied to pleadings so framed. Certain forms of allegation had come to have an established legal meaning, whether by force of legal practice or of express decision. Under the present system the pleader is to state the facts, and his statements must be construed as such statements would be in any other documents. We believe that no volume of precedents existed bearing the same position with regard to equity drafting as Bullen and Leake bore with regard to common law pleading, and this fact indicates the difficulty that exists—though, perhaps, in a less degree—with regard to the present system. The difficulty under the present system is to observe the distinction between pleading facts and mere evidence of facts. We doubt whether this distinction is in all cases capable of being satisfactorily observed, and we suspect that there is considerable variety of style in different quarters in this respect. We have seen many statements of claim which are in substance only an old declaration cut up into paragraphs, while on the other hand we have seen some pleadings which looked like a *precis* of a counsel's opening speech.

The authors of the present work state in their preface that the various pleadings which are contained in the body of the work have, in nearly every case, been settled by counsel of standing at the bar, and formed part of the record in cases that have been carried on up to trial, or actually tried, since the Judicature Acts came into operation. Such pleadings, as the authors observe, possess the advantage of having passed the adverse criticism of opposing counsel, and, in some cases, the ordeal of a

contest at judges' chambers or in court. We believe, as we have said before, that these precedents will be of considerable use, but any one using the present work must remember that it does not follow that because a form of pleading has passed muster in one action there is therefore nothing which might have been objected to in it. We cannot profess to have done much more than glance at the forms given; no reviewer can be expected to read through a collection of precedents. Time and experience alone can effectually show how far the work is valuable. As far as we can judge, the authors have exercised a careful and sound judgment in their selection; but even in the cursory glance we have been able to give, we have found a set of forms which are obviously taken from the pleadings in an action which came under our own notice; and we feel doubtful whether, if there had been an application at judge's chambers, one of the alternative lines of defence set up ought not to have been struck out as embarrassing. It would involve too long a digression to go into the details of this case, and we are very far from meaning that the authors were wrong in including this precedent; we only mention this to show that caution must be employed in the use of these precedents.

The work contains a treatise on the new rules of pleading which is well-written, but would bear compression. There is rather too much stringing together of lengthy quotations from judgments. This may, and we are inclined to think does, increase the value of the treatise to a person perusing it for the purpose of instruction, but for a person rapidly hunting over a work for the purposes of reference a more annotative disjointed style is better. The reader is constantly getting entangled in very long quotations, the purport of which cannot be rapidly grasped. The work is in its character one of reference rather than instruction, and therefore we think it open to some slight amount of criticism in the above respect. To most of the precedents there are notes, similar to those in Bullen and Leake, referring to the decisions which are most useful to the pleader in connection with the particular cause of action involved. We are disposed to think that this is the most valuable portion of the work. It is extremely convenient to have some work which collects notes of this sort in connection with pleading. In conclusion, there is one matter about which we must grumble, and that is the index. It is full of titles which refer only to other titles in the index. Almost all the more specific titles are not paged but refer to the general headings. This occasionally leads to error. For instance, under the head of "Title or Dignity," to be stated in description of party," we are referred to "Pleadings." The reference apparently should have been to "Parties."

REGISTRATION.

THE PARLIAMENTARY AND MUNICIPAL REGISTRATION ACT, 1878. By G. LATHOM BROWNE, Barrister-at-Law. Stevens & Sons.

This is a useful little book, though of an unpretentious character. The introduction is not much more than a paraphrase of the provisions of the Act. Such paraphrases may be of some value in books where from the nature of the work it is impossible to do more than summarize the provisions of an Act; but where, as in the present work, the full text of the Act is set out with notes, we doubt the advantage of precluding with a lengthy paraphrase. The author does not, in his notes, hazard much by way of interpretation of the Act. Herein he is perhaps wise. We doubt the advisability of a very elaborate work on the Act, because in truth its provisions will ultimately be most conveniently treated in new editions of the standard works on Registration. But till such editions are published, or for those who having already the former editions may not care to buy new editions, this little work will, doubtless, prove very handy.

General Correspondence.

COUNSELS' CLERKS' FEES.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—On the circuit where I live, as well as in town, I find that of late counsels' clerks are "trying on" considerably higher fees than those given by the authorized scale. In cases where the fee on the brief is ten guineas and upwards they are asking for £5 per cent. on the brief fee. Thus, in a case now before me, where I have marked my leader's brief 100 guineas, the scale gives on a fifty guineas fee and upwards a clerk's fee of £2 10s. per cent., but in my case the clerk holds out his hand for £5; and on the refresher brief fee of thirty guineas, where the scale gives 20s. for the clerk, the latter worthy asks for £1 10s.

Nor is my junior counsel's clerk a whit less modest, for whilst his master's brief and refresher fees were marked thirty-five and twenty guineas respectively—the scale fees to the clerk upon which are 20s. and 15s.—he sends in an account charging 35s. and 20s.

Now, I only want to do what is right and usual, but what is such? The taxing masters, I believe, only allow scale fees, and the question is whether we solicitors ought to let our clients pay the difference out of their own pockets, for this is what it really comes to. It is sufficiently notorious that counsel have increased their fees largely of late years, but I fail to see why their clerks should value their services more highly.

A SOLICITOR.

Nov. 5.

THE LAW LIST.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—More than a month ago I issued a writ of summons against a person residing in a small town in Yorkshire, where this year's *Law List* gives the names of two solicitors practising, to one of whom I sent the writ for service. From then till now I have not been able to get the affidavit of the service from the solicitor, although he wrote and told me he had served the writ a day or two after I sent it to him. The secret of it is that, although the solicitor's name appeared as practising at the town in question, yet both he and the other solicitor whose name appears in the *Law List* at the same place are also described as practising at another town, and in my case it turns out that some old clerk to the solicitor to whom I sent the writ, and who actually served it, and has made the affidavit of service, won't send it on until the solicitor has paid him something he says the solicitor owes him, whilst the solicitor says he does not regularly practise at the place named, but only occasionally goes there.

This is not an isolated case, and there is scarcely a solicitor in large practice who has not suffered from the delay (and often loss) arising from sending document, or writing to a solicitor at a place where by the *Law List* he appears to be practising, and after a long delay getting a reply acknowledging receipt, &c., and saying that as he only goes once a week or the like to the place where he was addressed, he has only just had the letter, &c.

As I write, I have opened this year's *Law List*, and at hazard I find under a neighbouring town the name of an ubiquitous young solicitor of between three and four years' standing as professing to practise at no fewer than seven places. Now this, be it remembered, is only one of a score of similar cases to be found in the *Law List*, but I am sure the gentleman in question does not maintain seven offices and clerks in as many different towns; and I say, therefore, that it is absolutely misleading to publish the intimation that a man practises at half-a-dozen places many miles apart, whereas in truth, and in fact, he has an office and a clerk at but one place only, and only occasionally visits the other places named.

As I write I further turn to Clifton in the *Law List*, which is practically as much a part of Bristol as Westminster is of London, and I see that no fewer than twenty-four Bristol solicitors appear as also practising at Clifton, whilst from my own personal knowledge of the place, I assert that not one of these twenty-four solicitors really "practises" there, and that there is not one of them who would dare or condescend to paint up on his private house gate or door post his name with "solicitor" after it, as he properly does at his office in Bristol.

The practical remedy for the evil complained of is for the Incorporated Law Society to interfere, and get the *Law List* authorities to refuse to describe a solicitor as actually practising at more places than one unless he guarantees that he (or a responsible clerk) is to be daily found at the places named. Such places might be indicated by being printed in Roman type, whilst places only occasionally visited might be printed in italics. All that is required for this is that, in the annual form filled up on the renewal of the certificate to practise, there should be a clause added to the following effect:—"And I declare that I *bona fide* practise or keep a responsible clerk at —, and that I occasionally practise or attend at —."

If the Incorporated Law Society would take this practical matter in hand, and bring about this much needed reform in the *Law List* of 1880—there is not time I fear for it in next year's issue—they would, I am sure, earn the thanks of not only their subscribing members, but also of the whole profession.

Nov. 5.

A LOCAL SOLICITOR
(Practising at one place only).

REMUNERATION OF SOLICITORS.

[To the Editor of the *Solicitors' Journal*.]

Sir,—In your last week's issue you inserted a letter from "L. S. D." commenting adversely on an advertisement enclosed by him and published by you, in which the advertiser, "X. L. X.", a solicitor, undertakes to carry out the legal business of sales and purchases for £5 and costs out of pocket.

It is possible that an ordinary assignment of a London or suburban leasehold may be carried out for £5 and costs out of pocket—instance the small charge of the building societies.

The usual lease and an assignment or two comprise most of the suburban titles. Why then should "X. L. X." be held up to opprobrium? Are there no other practices of the profession more open to objection than this, which is, at all events, honest and may be necessary?

November 6.

[But what about the advertising?—Ed. S. J.]

At the Devon and Exeter Winter Assizes recently Mr. Raymond Sarell, who had been committed for intimidating a witness for the prosecution of Mr. H. Ford, was on bail, and for the purpose of getting his case tried at this assize he was advised to surrender. He tendered himself to the governor of the county gaol, Mr. Kirkpatrick, on Saturday, but that gentleman refused to take him, and repeated the refusal after an intimation from Lord Coleridge that the man was entitled to surrender. On taking his seat on Monday morning Lord Coleridge ordered the gaoler to receive Sarell into custody, and intimated that if any further difficulty was raised he would treat that official as he would any other person guilty of contempt of court. If he still declined, let him be brought before the court. Mr. Kirkpatrick, who was in his place by the dock, said, "I am here, my lord." The Chief Justice: I request you to receive the prisoner under due authority.—Mr. Kirkpatrick: I do so, my lord. The accused was then removed. At the rising of the court his lordship, addressing Mr. Kirkpatrick, said he was not aware that he based his objection to receive the prisoner on the ground that no written authority was presented to him.

New Orders, Etc.

JUDGES' CHAMBERS.

It is ordered that the following regulations for the conduct of business at the Judges' Chambers, Rolls-gardens, Chancery-lane, take effect and be observed on and after the 11th of November, 1878, until further order:—

1. All summonses for time only shall be made returnable at half-past ten o'clock, and be heard by the masters at eleven o'clock, in priority to the other business of the day.

2. All other summonses shall be made returnable at successive hours: such as are for hearing by the judge, commencing at eleven o'clock, if not attended by counsel, and if so attended, at two o'clock; and such as are for hearing by the masters, commencing at half-past eleven o'clock.

No more than twenty judges' summonses, nor more than sixty masters' summonses, shall be made returnable at the same hour.

3. Every summons which the masters have not jurisdiction to hear shall, before it is issued, be entered in numerical order in the proper column of a printed list to be kept by such one of the judges' clerks as may, by arrangement between them, be appointed for that purpose; and, in default of an arrangement, by each of the clerks in rotation for a week, commencing with the junior judge's clerk.

The list will contain two columns, one for summonses to be attended by counsel, and the other for summonses not so attended, with numbered lines, each commencing with No. 1.

4. Every summons, whether for hearing by the judge or the masters (other than a summons for time only), shall, before it is issued, be taken to the clerk in charge of the list, to have inserted thereon the hour of its return; and every judge's summons shall be numbered and marked according to its place in the list.

All summonses shall be returnable at the first hour at which the summons can be heard. No summons shall be made returnable at any later hour unless the previous numbers are all filled up.

No summons which the masters have jurisdiction to hear shall be entered in the list.

5. If any respondent to a judge's summons not entered in the column for counsel be desirous of attending by counsel, he shall give notice thereof, before the hour of its return, to the opposite party, and to the clerk in charge of the list, who shall thereupon transfer the summons from the one column to the first vacant number in the other column.

6. The summonses in the judge's list shall be called on in their order. If neither party appears, the summons shall be passed over till the list for the hour has been gone through. The summonses passed over shall then be called on a second time in their order. If neither party then appears, it shall be struck out. If one party only appears, an order may be made *ex parte*, upon an affidavit of service, either granting or dismissing the application, as the case may be, and either with or without costs.

No affidavit of non-attendance shall be required or allowed, as regards any summons in the list.

7. When a summons has been struck out, the application shall not be heard except upon a second summons, to be issued only by leave of a judge.

8. If, when the counsels' list is called on, any summonses returnable at a previous hour should not have been disposed of, they shall stand adjourned till and be taken first on the following day, except such as both parties desire to be taken after the counsels' list shall have been exhausted.

9. *Ex parte* applications to the judge shall be heard at the close of the day, unless convenient intervals shall occur during the earlier hours.

10. No affidavit used at chambers shall be taken away without the express leave of the judge or the master; but the same shall be delivered, duly stamped, to the door-keeper, to be filed, whose duty it shall be to see that this order is complied with.

11. As early as practicable every afternoon a copy of the list for the following day shall be exhibited in a conspicuous place outside the Judges' Chambers. At the opening of the chambers on the following morning, a copy shall also be exhibited in each of the halls.

12. The clerk in charge of the list is authorized to receive and file written consents to orders and to adjournments, and he will correct the list for the day accordingly.

13. The judge and the masters will attend every day at eleven o'clock, and continue their sittings (as far as may be practicable) till the business is disposed of.

14. Solicitors are invited to bring their summonses ready filled up, and take them to the respective judges' clerks to be signed, and entered and marked, as above directed.

15. The order of business before the masters will for the present remain as before.

WILLIAM FIELD.

J. W. HUDDLESTON.

NATHL. LINDLEY.

H. MANISTY.

H. HAWKINS.

HENRY C. LOPES.

A. E. COCKBURN.

COLERIDGE.

FITZROY KELLY.

JOHN MELLOR.

ROBT. LUSH.

ANTHONY CLEASBY.

W. R. GROVE.

GEORGE DENMAN.

C. E. POLLOCK.

Cases of the Week.

APPEAL—SECURITY FOR COSTS—POVERTY OF APPELLANT—SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES—ORD. 58, R. 15.—Notice of appeal having been given by the plaintiff in the case of *Hankin v. Turner*, from the decision of Lush, J. (noted 22 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 951), the defendant applied on the 2nd inst. to the Court of Appeal for an order that the plaintiff should give security for the costs of the appeal. On the 30th of September last, letters of administration to the estate of an intestate were granted in common form by the Probate Division to the defendant, who alleged that he was the half-brother of the intestate, and one of his next of kin. On the 8th of October the writ in *Hankin v. Turner* was issued, by which the plaintiff claimed as sole next of kin of the intestate, against the defendant as administrator of his personal estate, to have the personal estate administered under the direction of the Chancery Division of the High Court, and claimed also an injunction to restrain the defendant from getting in and disposing of, or otherwise dealing with the estate. The plaintiff alleged that he was the maternal uncle of the intestate, and that the defendant was not related to him at all. The application to Lush, J., was for an injunction and the appointment of a receiver. The plaintiff had not applied to the Probate Division to recall the grant of administration, and Lush, J., refused the application made to him, on the ground that it could not be maintained so long as the letters of administration were unrecalled, they being founded on the defendant's legal title; as one of the next of kin, to administer the estate, which, if the plaintiff's allegations were true, the defendant had no title to do: In support of the application for security for costs, evidence was adduced that the plaintiff had been for several years, and still was, in the receipt of parish relief, and this evidence was uncontradicted. On behalf of the plaintiff, it was argued that the poverty of the appellant was not in itself a "special circumstance" authorizing the court to require security to be given, and reliance was placed on what was said by the Court of Appeal in *Uitil v. Brearley* (L. R. 3 C. P. D. 206). And it was further pointed out that in *Wilson v. Smith* (34 W. R. 421, L. R. 2 Ch. D. 67, 20 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 390), and other reported cases where security had been required, the appeal had been from a final decision or judgment, whereas

in the present case the appeal was only from an interlocutory order, and if the plaintiff should be, by reason of his inability to give security, prevented from prosecuting his appeal, there would still be nothing to prevent his continuing the proceedings in the action up to the trial. The court (Lord Cairns, L.C., and Baggallay, Brett, and Cotton, L.JJ.) ordered security to the amount of £20 to be given. Lord Cairns said that the case was a very singular one. The plaintiff, in effect, said that he claimed the right to compel the defendant to administer the estate under an instrument which said that the defendant was that which the plaintiff himself said that he was not, viz., one of the next of kin of the intestate. This was very like an attempt to approbate and reprobate the letters of administration. It was not denied that the plaintiff was a pauper. It was not necessary to say whether the court would, in every case of a pauper appellant, require security for costs to be given. But, when a pauper came into the court to engage in a contest such as that in the present case, his lordship was of opinion that there were "special circumstances" within the meaning of rule 15. Cotton, L.J., said that, *prima facie*, the insolvency of the appellant gave the respondent a right to security for the costs of the appeal, and there was certainly no reason in this case for not applying that rule.

TRADE-MARK—RECTIFICATION OF REGISTER—STRIKING OUT—TRADE-MARKS REGISTRATION ACT, 1875 (33 & 39 VICT.), s. 5.—In a case of *Re Marler's Trade-Mark*, before the Master of the Rolls, on the 2nd inst., an application was made under the 5th section of the Trade-Marks Registration Act, 1875, to rectify the register by altering the name of the owner of a trade-mark under the following circumstances:—Marler, the agent of the real owners of a trade-mark, had, without their authority, registered the trade-mark in his own name. The real owners, by consent of Marler, now applied to alter the register, showing their names as owners, or to expunge the trade-mark altogether. The Master of the Rolls considered that he had no jurisdiction in such a case to rectify the register; the section was not intended to apply to a case where the wrong person altogether had been registered. All he could do would be to direct the registration to be struck out, with liberty to the real owners to register their own trade-mark with the usual advertisement.

PRACTICE—RULE AS TO COSTS WHERE LEGAL CLAIM SUCCESSFUL.—In a case of *Bartholomew Hospital v. Phillips*, before the Master of the Rolls on the 4th inst., his lordship made some interesting observations on the right of persons to costs when they succeeded in a case of pure legal demand, however hard the circumstances might be. The case related to the payment of tithes in the City of London, they having been fixed at a certain rate on the rental in the days of Queen Elizabeth. The lay impropriator, after having accepted a less sum for over 200 years, now claimed the whole amount as fixed in Queen Elizabeth's time on the present rack rentals of the property, and notwithstanding the enormous increase of value since the rate was fixed. The Master of the Rolls was clearly of opinion that such a claim was never intended to have been made, but still was obliged, on the legal rights of the plaintiffs, to make an order in their favour. As to the costs, he said, whatever his opinion as to the nature of the claim, he considered that where a person succeeded in a legal demand he had no judicial discretion in the matter, and was bound to give the successful party his costs. Wherever a plaintiff asserted a legal title which was resisted, he could not see why he should be mulcted in costs merely because he relied on a legal title which, perhaps, he should not have done. He, therefore, gave the plaintiffs the whole costs of the suit.

MORTGAGOR AND MORTGAGEE—ESTATE BY ESTOPPEL—GRANT—ABSOLUTE COVENANTS FOR TITLE.—In a case of the *General Finance Mortgage Company v. Liberator Benefit Building Society*, before the Master of the Rolls on the 6th inst., a question arose somewhat similar to one raised in the case of *Heath v. Creak* (23 W. R. 95, L. R. 10 Ch. 23), whether an estate in fee by estoppel could be supported by the grant and the absolute covenants for title contained in a mortgage deed. One Downes persuaded the plaintiffs to advance him a sum of £300, producing to them as title

deeds of certain hereditaments at Camberwell, in the county of Surrey, certain documents forged by himself. On the 14th of May, 1875, Downs had no interest whatever in the property, but nevertheless, by an indenture of mortgage of that date, he granted and conveyed to the plaintiffs the said hereditaments in consideration of the sum of £800, subject to redemption. This indenture contained no recitals, but it contained the usual absolute covenants for title entered into by mortgagors. The defendants subsequently agreed to lend Downs a sum sufficient to enable him to procure a conveyance of the fee simple of the said hereditaments, and also a further sum. It was arranged that the fee should be conveyed to Downs, and should then be mortgaged again to the defendants, and this was carried out by an indenture of conveyance and an indenture of mortgage, both dated the 20th of May, 1875. On a special case stated under the Judicature Acts, the plaintiffs now contended that, by virtue of the grant, and the absolute covenants for title contained in the mortgage to them, Downs was estopped from denying that the legal estate had subsequently become vested in him; and that they were entitled to priority. The Master of the Rolls said that the whole doctrine of the acquisition of a legal estate by estoppel depended upon authority, which he did not feel disposed in any way to extend as against a mortgagee equally innocent with the plaintiffs. He considered that the case as to the grant was governed by *Heath v. Creaklock*, where Lord Cairns laid it down that a conveyance by grant created no estoppel. That as to the covenants, inasmuch as a statement, to create an estoppel, must also, in the words of Lord Cairns, be "precise and unambiguous," he considered that absolute covenants for title were not sufficiently distinct to create it. Such covenants might be satisfied by a power coupled with the right to call on a trustee having the legal estate, to convey, or by a legal power under the Statute of Uses, or under a will by bargain and sale. No authority had been shown for the proposition that a covenant would do, and he was by no means prepared to decide that it would.

Societies.

LAW ASSOCIATION.

The usual monthly meeting of the directors was held on Thursday the 7th inst., at the Hall of the Incorporated Law Society, Chancery-lane, the following being present—viz., Mr. Desborough (chairman), Mr. Tylee, and Messrs. Charles Burt, Carpenter, Collison, Desborough, jun., Drew, Nisbet, Sawtell, Sidney Smith, Styan, and Boodle (secretary). A grant of £60 was made to the daughter of a deceased member; one of £5 to the widow of a non-member; and £10 was granted to an aged solicitor in embarrassed circumstances; two new members were elected, and the ordinary general business was transacted.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

This society held the first meeting of their forty-third annual session on Tuesday evening, the 29th of October, at the Law Institution, Chancery-lane, Mr. C. Swinfen Eady, LL.D., in the chair. After some preliminary business had been disposed of, the society proceeded to the discussion of the question appointed for the debate: "Are the true interests of Englishmen promoted by a policy leading to the disintegration of the empire?" Mr. A. M. Ellis, LL.B., opened the discussion at some length and maintained the negative; he was followed by Mr. E. I. Crosse, B.A., in the affirmative, and Mr. Collier in the negative. The debate being open, several members addressed the meeting, the opener replied, and on the question being put to the vote it was decided in the negative by a majority of seven. Twenty-four members were present.

At the usual weekly meeting of this society held at the Law Institution, Chancery-lane, on the 5th inst., Mr. J. E. Stevens in the chair, the question appointed for the debate was—"A. demises to B.; a clause in the lease giving B. the option of purchasing the fee simple of the premises therein comprised. The option is exercised by B. after A.'s death. Does the doctrine of conversion apply as from the date of the lease?"—the cases referred to being *Louis v. Bennett* (1 Cox. 167); *Townley v. Bedwell* (14 Ves. 591); *Collingwood v. Rose* (5 W. R. 404); *Edwards v. West* (26 W. R. 567).

Mr. A. M. Ellis, LL.B., opened the discussion for the affirmative, and Mr. G. H. Bower and Mr. Cooper supported the negative. At the conclusion of the debate the chairman summed up, and the question was decided by a majority of votes in the negative.

UNITED LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

The society met at the Law Institution on Monday, the 28th ult., under the presidency of Mr. E. C. Rawlings. The following legal moot was opened for discussion by Mr. W. F. Hamilton:—"Is the following dictum good law—If an infant pay money with his own hand without a valuable consideration for it, he cannot get it back again?" Messrs. Gatey, Moyle, Pickersgill, Gidney, and other gentlemen took part in the debate. The question was eventually carried in the negative by a majority of two. Mr. C. Kains-Jackson presided at the usual weekly meeting held on Wednesday last. Mr. Sayer, on behalf of Mr. Cross, introduced the following subject for debate, viz.:—"That the liberty of trade and amusement should be under no restriction with respect to Sunday observance." Messrs. Moyle and Havergal opposed, and Mr. Ashton Cross supported the resolution. Messrs. Owen and Pickersgill also spoke to the question, which was unanimously negatived by a majority of seven.

The usual weekly meeting took place at Clement's-inn Hall on Wednesday last, Mr. W. C. Owen in the chair. On the motion of Mr. T. Eustace Smith, seconded by Mr. F. B. Moyle, the Lord Chancellor was unanimously elected president of the society in the place of the late Lord Chelmsford. Mr. A. J. Parker opened the following question for discussion, viz.:—"That the system of education adopted by our public schools and universities is unsatisfactory in its results." The affirmative was supported by Messrs. Eustace Smith, Pickersgill, Pain, Curtis, and Mr. Julien, of the Oxford Union Society; the speakers on the negative side being Messrs. Hazard, Collyer, Havergal, and Moyle. At the conclusion of an interesting debate, the chairman summed up, and the motion, being put to the meeting, was carried by a majority of two.

The above society also held a joint debate on Monday, the 4th inst., with the Westminster Union Society, the subject being, "That this House disapproves of our going to war with Afghanistan." The question was opened on behalf of the United Law Students' Society by Mr. J. Ashton Cross, and seconded by Mr. W. C. Owen, being opposed by Messrs. Bonser and Tiechurst. A most animated debate ensued, the motion being finally carried by a considerable majority. There was a large attendance.

In the Queen's Bench Division on Saturday the Lord Chief Justice announced that, in consequence of so many members of the circuits—the northern and north-eastern—being absent on the assizes, which might lead to inconvenience as to motions for new trials (which are required by the rules to be made within the first four days of term), the court had determined, as regarded those circuits, to allow four days after the termination of each of those circuits for motions for new trials, as to the past circuit as well as the present, only they should require that a list of the cases in which motions were to be made should be suspended in court within four days of the present time.

The prospectus of an Egyptian five per cent. loan has been issued by Messrs. Rothschild & Sons. The nominal amount is £5,500,000, and the price of issue is £73 payable by instalments up to May 19, 1879, but payment in full may be made under discount at the rate of five per cent. per annum. The bonds, both principal and interest, will be payable in gold free from all Egyptian taxes; they will be issued to bearer in sums of £20, £40, £100, £200, and £1,000, with coupons payable half-yearly, on the 1st of June and the 1st of December, at the offices of Messrs. N. M. Rothschild & Sons, London, in pounds sterling. The loan will be secured on the property transferred by the Khedive and his family to the State, and the net revenue of which amounts altogether to £422,428 sterling per annum, according to the estimate in the lists given to the Committee of Inquiry. Subscription lists will be opened in London on Monday, the 11th of November, and will be closed on Tuesday, the 12th of November.

Legal News.

Mr. Justice Lush and Mr. Justice Denman are the two election judges for the ensuing year.

On Tuesday, in the Queen's Bench Division, the Lord Chief Justice announced that, though juries had been summoned for Thursday, it was impossible to hold any *nisi prius* sittings this week. There was a good deal of business to be done in *bank*, and there were only two judges of this division at present available; for Mr. Justice Manisty was on circuit, and would not be back till next week; Mr. Justice Field was the judge at chambers; and Mr. Justice Lush was engaged on the Criminal Law Commission, so that the court would lose the benefit of his valuable services for some time; so that it was impossible, for the present, to have *nisi prius* sittings here.

At the opening of the Michaelmas Sittings, in the Common Pleas Division, at the Four Courts, Dublin, on Saturday, there was a large attendance of members of the bar in expectation of a judicial reference to the loss the bench had sustained by the death of Judge Keogh. Chief Justice Morris said that since the court had met they had had to regret the loss of a colleague—Mr. Justice Keogh. The Irish bench would feel the loss of one of its most gifted and brilliant members, and one who, though dying at a comparatively early age, had become the senior, not alone of the Irish judicial bench, but of the judicial body of the United Kingdom. The Attorney-General, on behalf of the bar of Ireland, acknowledged the uniform courtesy and friendliness shown toward the profession by the distinguished and able judge.

"A Solicitor," writing to the *Times*, says that he recently carried in to the taxing master's offices two bills for taxation, and the earliest appointments he could obtain were, in the one case, two hours on the 19th of December, and in the other four hours on the 9th of January. Meantime some £25,000 was locked up in court to the inconvenience of the parties entitled. "Two additional masters are urgently required, and the refusal to appoint them is senseless, as they would be self-supporting from the fees charged." "Legal Practitioners" add, "We can quite sympathize with your correspondent 'A Solicitor' in his complaint as to the delay in the taxing master's office. Bad, however, as his case is, what will he think when he hears that a bill of costs which was carried in more than five months ago is not to be taxed till the beginning of December, notwithstanding that repeated applications were made for an appointment before the long vacation commenced—the delay in this case also preventing the distribution of a large sum of money to creditors? We fail to see why a great portion of the bills, especially those between party and party, should not be taxed in the same manner as they are in the common law divisions."

On the 25th ult., at the Middlesex Sessions, Charles James Bray pleaded guilty to a charge of stealing a cheque of the value of £64 4s. 9d., the property of Messrs. Paterson, Snow, & Bloxam, his masters. Mr. Lewis, on the part of the prosecution, said that he was instructed by the prisoner's employers most strongly to recommend him to mercy. He had entered their service at a very early age, and by his great assiduity and perseverance in his work had raised himself gradually to the position of common-law clerk in their office, at a salary of £150 a year. To render himself capable of fulfilling the duties of that post, he had with great care educated himself and had obtained the confidence of the firm in which he was employed. Unfortunately, some time ago he had fallen into the company of betting men, and by transactions on the turf and extravagance had become so involved that he was tempted to take money from the office. The specific charge against him was for stealing £64 4s. 9d., but the whole amount of the defalcation was at least £900. Still, considering his former career and long service, they prayed the court to look as leniently as possible on the case, and not to pass a sentence of penal servitude. Mr. Douglas Straight, for the prisoner, said that after what had fallen from his learned friend he was almost reluctant to say anything in addition, but besides what had been stated there was a fact he would like to mention. The prisoner had lately married, and the consequence of his conviction was to leave his wife and child entirely penni-

less. He concluded by making a strong appeal to the court for mercy, on account of the prisoner's honesty, assiduity, and integrity in his office life. Mr. Sergeant Cox, in passing sentence, said that, in consequence of the recommendation on the part of the prosecution and the prayer of the defence, he had decided to refrain from passing a sentence of penal servitude. Still, he felt it his duty to give a very long term of imprisonment. The prisoner would have to undergo eighteen months' imprisonment with hard labour.

Law Student's Journal.

COUNCIL OF LEGAL EDUCATION.

MICHAELMAS EXAMINATION, 1878.

GENERAL EXAMINATION OF STUDENTS OF THE INNS OF COURT held at Lincoln's-inn Hall, on the 22nd, 23rd, 24th, and 25th of October, 1878.

The Council of Legal Education have awarded to the following students certificates that they have satisfactorily passed a public examination:—

William Raeburn St. Clair Andrew, Arthur William Bairstow, Leicester Paul Beaufort, Stanley Carr Boulter, Albert Gray, Alexander Smith Harvey, Archibald Fitzgerald Law, Howard Meuric Lloyd, George Robert Laxon Marriott, James Abram McCarthy, Alexander Grant McIntyre, Vernon Leslie Eden Miller, Walter Boldero Paton, Harry Quilter, Pollexfen Colmore Coplestone Radcliffe, Richard Arthur Roberts, Charles Duncombe Shafto, and George Stallard, of the Inner Temple; Edwin Francis Ashworth Briggs, John Mountstart Elphinstone Gouldsbury, Nicholas John Littleton, Hildebrand Ogle Moore, Herbert Rushworth, Robert Frederick Wittingham Shawe, Russell Spratt, and Edmund Wren, of the Middle Temple; Richard Naylor Arkle, Jonathan Dunn, Frederick Warburton Dunston, John William Evans, Robert Albert Jones, Charles Carmichael Lacaita, Percival Maitland Lawrence, John Mason Lightwood, Henry Harrison Pownall, Ernest Radford, Edward Arthur Scratchley, Henry Charles Seddon, George Heywood Maudslayi Sumner, and Frederick Winney, of Lincoln's-inn; and William Symon, of Gray's-inn, Esq.

The following students passed a satisfactory examination in Roman Law:—

Frederick Michael Abrahams, Arthur Towydyr Davis Berrington, William Robert Boufield, Nathaniel Foderingham Briggs, John Brooks, Cecil Delves Broughton, John Fielden Cobbett, William Henry Cross, Benedictus De Korte, Frank Joseph Fisher, Harold Holcroft, Frederick Arthur Hyndman, Edward Allvey Jennings, Sir Kennett Hagar Kemp, Bart., Frederick John Lewis, James Lumb, William Bunce Milton, William Henry Myers, Synd Abdur Rahman, Arnold George Rogers, Robert Henville Simonds, Richard Solomon, Charles Caleb Williamson, and John Wingfield, of the Inner Temple; Dinshan Danjidhai Davar, Francis Cuthbert Fishbourne, William Brandford Griffith, John Edwin Hewick, Saggid Neurue Huda, Nobushige Irie, William Jeans, George Victor De Kivern, Lewis Levy, John Lloyd, William Robert Palmer, Naoshi Sagisaka, Francis Robert Winn Sampson, Syed Sherfuddin, and Frank Lawrence Toole, of the Middle Temple; and Hugh Oakley Arnold, Amaury Macnamara Bouchier, Emile Henri Cannot, William Henley Chater, Frederick John Church, Walter Ivimey Cook, Marcus Synnot Crawford, Percy Dawson, George Denison Faber, Richard Farrell, Joshua Leslie Field, William Coryton Graham, James Lennox Hamilton, Henry Hobhouse, Avary William Holmes, Horace Hayes Montgomery Lawrence, Frank Alexander Milne, Krishna Nath Mitra, Thomas Coney Tunnard Moore, Louis Edward Raphael, James Lewis Somers Roemalle-Cock, and William Ingham Shaw, of Lincoln's-inn, Esq.

By Order of the Council,

(Signed) S. H. WALPOLE, Chairman.

Council Chambers, Lincoln's-inn, Nov. 1.

Court Papers.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

| Date. | COURT OF APPEAL. | MASTER OF THE ROLLS. | V.C. MALINS. |
|--------------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| Saturday, Nov. 9 | Mr. Leach | Mr. Merivale | Mr. Ward |
| Monday 11 | Milne | Farrer | Kee |
| Tuesday 12 | Merivale | King | Clowes |
| Wednesday 13 | Milne | Farrer | Kee |
| Thursday 14 | Merivale | King | Clowes |
| Friday 15 | Milne | Farrer | Kee |

V. C. BACON.

V. C. HALL.

Mr. Justice

Fry.

| | | | |
|--------------------|------------|---------|--------------|
| Saturday, Nov. 9 | Mr. Farrer | Mr. Kee | Mr. Holdship |
| Monday 11 | Holdship | Latham | Pemberton |
| Tuesday 12 | Teesdale | Leach | Ward |
| Wednesday 13 | Holdship | Latham | Pemberton |
| Thursday 14 | Teesdale | Leach | Ward |
| Friday 15 | Holdship | Latham | Pemberton |

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

MIDDLESEX.

MICHAELMAS SITTING, 1878.

This list contains all actions entered in Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer Divisions, in which notice of trial has been given; and also all actions in the Chancery Division, in which notice has been given of trial before a judge and jury, up to and including 4th November, 1878.

LIST OF ACTIONS FOR TRIAL.

- Ex 1 Hall (In Person) v Gill (Richards and W), postponed
 Ex 2 Beeton (Millward and W) v Mason (Mead and B), postponed
 CP 3 West (Meynell and P) v De la Warr (Cope and Co), stayed SJ
 Q B 4 Woolf (R and E Bastard) v Harris and Co (A Pulbrook)
 Ex 5 Ball (Duncan, M W and G) v Moore (Crowdy and Son), commission
 Ex 6 Hickey (Belgrave and M) v Montefiore (Lewis and Lewis), commission SJ
 Q B 7 Creed (A J Murray) v Millett (Roscoe, H and S) commission
 Ex 8 Kendrick (G J and P Vanderpump) v Scarth (Torr and Co), stayed
 Ex 9 Bright and ors (Hargrove and Co) v The Telegraph Construction, & Co (Bircham and Co), commission SJ
 Ex 10 Berridge (Willoughby and Cox) v Roberts (Harris and Godwin), stayed SJ
 Q B 11 Brown (Merriman, M and Co) v Elkington and ors (Lumley and L), commission
 Q B 12 Whitaker (J Frost) v Brevitt (W Maynard), postponed
 CP 13 Gledhill (Harper, B and B) v Brown and ors (Janson, C and P) SJ
 CP 14 Griffiths (M G Geoghegan) v London and St Katharine Docks Co (Humphreys and Son) SJ
 Ex 15 Bishop and anr (A D Smith) v Black (Pownall and Co), stayed
 CP 16 Wilbraham (Chapman, T and B) v The Maritime Passengers and Mariners Insurance Co, lmd (Harrisons and Co), stayed
 Ex 17 Tolme (J B Batten) v Whitby, Redcar and Middlesborough Union Ry Co (Tillett and Co), commission
 Q B 18 D'Oyley (Markby and Co) v Heynemann and anr (Johnson and Co; Elmelle and Co), commission SJ
 Q B 19 Cammion (Shum and Co) v Gowland (Harcourt and M) SJ
 Q B 20 Asp, Berger and Co (Combe and W) v Le Fevre and Co (W G Colley), commission
 Ex 21 Morton (O B Wooler) v Maxwell (J J Kelly), stayed SJ
 Ex 22 Maxwell (J J Kelly) v Morton (O B Wooler), stayed SJ
 Q B 23 Sawbridge and anr (N Bennett) v Eggar (Walker & Co)
 CP 24 Woodrow (J Robinson) v The Albion Life Assurance Society (J C Campbell), stayed
 Q B 25 Provand (Lindo and Co) v Langton and anr (J E Fox and Co), commission
 Q B 26 Powis (Combe and W) v Tench (Pownall, Son, C and K), stayed
 Chy 27 Dressed (W Eley) v The Rhenish Westphalian Lloyd (Druce and Co)
 Q B 28 Benjamin (J Frost) v Litten (F A Lewty), commission
 Q B 29 The Commissioners of the Admiralty (Harc and F) v Dowthwaite (Maples and Co) SJ
 CP 30 Brown (C M Elborough) v London and Yorkshire Bank (Bischoff, B and B), stayed SJ
 Q B 31 Sir R Hill and ors (Bischoff, B and B) v The Managers of the Metropolitan Asylum District (Few and Co) SJ
 Q B 32 Milne (G Brown) v Holmes and ors (L Pass; J E Brown; G J and P Vanderpump), stayed
 CP 33 Cabero (W F Nokes) v Mapleson (J and R Gole), stayed
 CP 34 Scott (Sorrrell and Son) v Phyeay (S H Head) SJ
 Q B 35 Benjamin (M Abrahams and R) v Higginbottom (F T Dubois), commission SJ
 CP 36 Michael (Wilkinson and H) v The East and West India Dock Co (Freshfields and W), stayed SJ
 CP 37 Brockelbank and Co (Kisch, Son and H) v King's Lynn Steam Shipping Co (Flux and L), stayed SJ
 Q B 38 Hallward (C B Hallward) v Blandford and ors (C J Curtis; H K Fisher)
 Q B 39 The London Financial Association, lmd (Markby, T and S) v France (Denne and T) SJ
 Q B 40 Joshua (A E Webb) v Green (Harc and F), commission
- Ex 41 Palmes (Lake, B and Co) v Hope and anr (Shoubridge and M), without jury, postponed
 Ex 42 Same (Same) v Beavan (Same), without jury, postponed
 Ex 43 Llywdarth Iron, & Co (Houghton and B) v Fearn (A S H Jones), commission
 Ex 44 Gonzalez, Byass & Co (Tamplin, T & J) v Mackenzie (S Toppin), commission
 Q B 45 Hallett (In Person) v Hallett (Duncan, M & Co)
 Q B 46 Marks & anr (Abraham & R) v Weininger (Chapman & Co), commission SJ
 CP 47 Rintoul (J Knight) v Heynemann (Johnson, U & Co) commn
 Q B 48 Mayer (A G Ditton) v Robinson (P-W Naser) commission
 Ex 49 Spiller (O E Goldring) v Baum (Evans & E) postponed
 Q B 50 Church (Fitch & F) v Hutton (Tidy, H & T)
 Ex 51 Hallett (Duncan & Co) v Hall tt (In Person)
 Q B 52 General Share Trust Co lmd (J S Coleman) v Baum and anr (Evans and E), stayed
 Q B 53 Whistler (J A Rose) v Ruskin (Walker, M and C), SJ
 CP 54 The Bilson and Crump Meadows Colliery Co lmd (Ashurst, M C and Co) v Gould and anr (Rogerson and F; Ingledew and Co), SJ
 Ex 55 Abbott (L Barnett) v De Winton (A H Miller)
 Ex 56 Colman (J Pettengill) v Savage (J Scott)
 Q B 57 Thomson (T Lidiard and Co) v Nanson (H C Barker)
 Ex 58 Enthoven (Collette and C) v Jacobson (M Cooke), postpd
 Q B 59 Van Dieren (Webster and G) v Oxenham (S F and H Noyes)
 CP 60 Brotherhood and anr (Cope and Co) v Sugden (Clarke and Son), postponed SJ
 CP 61 Chamberlaine (S G Ashwin) v Barnwell, Clerk (Whitaker and W), stayed SJ
 CP 62 Same (Same) v T W Wallington (Same), stayed SJ
 CP 63 Chamberlaine (S G Ashwin) v J Wallington (Whitaker and W), stayed SJ
 CP 64 Wertheimer (Bircham and Co) v Phillips (Beyfus and B), postponed SJ
 Ex 65 L and N Western Ry Co (R F Roberts) v Metropolitan District Ry Co (Baxter and Co) SJ
 Ex 66 Hamand (J B Batten) v Leeman (Tillett and Co) SJ
 Q B 67 Delloye and Co (M Abrahams and R) v Combe (Brandons)
 Ex 68 Cheesewright (R P Upton) v Wells (Cumfrie, B and D), commission SJ
 Q B 69 Collins (R H B Macmillen) v The Vestry of Paddington (J H Horton) SJ
 Ex 70 Vincent (J J James) v London Brighton and South Coast Ry Co (Norton, B and Co) SJ
 CP 71 Olding and ors (Norton and C) v Duncan (H T Tiddeman)
 Ex 72 Forbes and anr (Thomson, Son and B) v Lee Conservancy Board (R J Pead) SJ
 Ex 73 Hobson (J Pettengill) v Crawcour and Co (Dixon, Ward and Co)
 Ex 74 Apothecaries Society (Swann and Co) v Shepperley (Burton Y and H) SJ
 CP 75 Frank (J Robinson) v Breslau (Crook and S), stayed
 Ex 76 Marshall (G M Cooke) v Lindley and anr (J Davies), postpd
 Ex 77 Lord Clarence Paget (Barlow and R) v Raggett and Sons (P Taylor) SJ
 Ex 78 Greaves (W F Morris) v Keene (F F Smallpiece) SJ
 Q B 79 Casswell (Crawley and A) v The Wimbledon Local Board (W H Whitfield) SJ
 Ex 80 Jacobson (G M Cooke) v Robinson and Fisher (R Thomas)
 Ex 81 Harvey (J C Selby) v South Eastern Ry Co (W R Stevens) SJ
 Ex 82 Carey (W O Reader) v Great Northern Ry Co (Nelson, B and N) SJ
 CP 83 Parker (J M Upfill) v Stevens (Burrows and B) SJ
 CP 84 Mosse (A J Murray) v Locke (Watkins, Baker and Co) SJ
 CP 85 Harrison (Bicknell and H) v Jones (In Person) SJ
 Ex 86 Flockhart (Shaan and Co) v Clarkson (Plews, I and Co) SJ
 Ex 87 Carnegie (Lyne and H) v Walker and Co (Flux and Co) SJ
 CP 88 East London Water Works Co (Bircham and Co) v Barber (G H and P Vanderpump) SJ
 Ex 89 Barber (G H and P Vanderpump) v East London Water Works Co (Bircham and Co) SJ
 Q B 90 Armstrong (W H Marshall) v Metropolitan District Ry Co (Baxter and Co)
 Ex 91 Holland and ors (Withall and C) v Evans and ors (Lewin and Co) SJ
 Q B 92 Underhill (H Dinan) v Penney (Harper and Co)
 Ex 93 Ward (G Reader) v Juson (Chappell and G)
 Ex 94 The New Westminster Brewery Co (Wilkins, B and F) v Caulcutt (C V Field), postponed
 CP 95 Willison (T Atanborough) v Aylett (H E Edgar)
 CP 96 Fordham (F C Greenfield) v Hipkins (Turner and Son) SJ
 Ex 97 Wiggins and Co (Mathews and S) v Duncan (Walton, B and W) SJ
 Q B 98 Denis Freres (M Abrahams and R) v The Agricultural and Horticultural Co-operative Association lmd (A F Barnard) commission
 CP 99 South Eastern Ry Co (W R Stevens) v Streeter (Marchant and P) SJ
 Q B 100 Procter (Jae Neal) v Derbyshire (Lewis, M and Co) SJ
 Ex 101 Glasier (R H Flater) v North Metropolitan Tram Co (H C Godfrey) SJ
 Q B 102 Fortune (T Fortune) v Collings (Lewis, M and L) SJ
 CP 103 Terry (G Davis Morgan and Co) v Banbury and Cheltenham Direct Ry Co (Hargroves and Co) SJ
 Ex 104 De Belville (Bolton and M) v Henderson (J S Ward)
 CP 105 Northcott (Kisch, Son & H) v Doughty (J Goren) stayed
 Q B 106 Goddard (Price and Stimson) v The Wimbledon Local Board (W H Whitfield) SJ
 Q B 107 Brice (Harrison, B and H) v Goldsmith (W T Hamlin), commission
 Ex 108 Carter (J S Cole) v Earl of Desart (Horn and M) SJ
 CP 109 Ellis (S Toppin) v The London Gas Light Co (H E Brown)
 CP 110 James (Digby & L) v Graham (G H Oliver)
 Ex 111 Hacker (Hutton and W) v The London Gas Light Co (H E Brown) SJ

- C P 112 Grant and wife (Lewis and Whitbourne) v London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Co (Norton, Rand Co) SJ
 C P 113 Migotti (Gold and Son) v Colville (Nicholson and H) SJ
 Ex 114 Edwards and ors (J D Blake) v Harris and Redford (C M Stretton) SJ
 C P 115 Haws (W W Wynne) v Wallace Bros (Johnson, W and Co) SJ
 Q B 116 Evans (West, K. A. and Co) v Lefevre (Trinder and H), commission SJ
 Ex 117 Barker (Hoppe and B) v Davey (J Fulcher) postponed
 Ex 118 Kilby and ors (E W Reeves) v Hosford and Wife (S M and J Benson) without jury
 Chy 119 Gt Eastern Ry Co (C A Curwood) v Harrington and anr (Cattams, J and H; Lowless and Co) SJ
 C P 120 Berry (R Charles) v Walker and ors (Flower and N)
 Ex 121 Jacobs (G M Cooke) v Ball (Turner and Son)
 C P 122 Wilson and ors (C J Partington) v Willis (Newman and L)
 Ex 123 Holmes (A Haynes and Sons) v London and Westminster Bank (L Diggles) SJ
 Ex 124 Jarvis (R A Kelley) v Davis (Smith and H)
 C P 125 Handley (Lewis and Sons) v Wood (Burchells)
 Ex 126 Bennett (E Kimber) v England (J Aldridge)
 C P 127 Hughes and Kimber, lmd (A S Edmunds) v Ludwig, Wilfers and Co (Bradford, R and Co)
 Ex 128 Pratt (J W Proudfoot) v Challen (Palmer, B and F)
 Ex 129 Hetherington (C A Swaine) v Field (J B Lay)
 C P 130 Elstob (C F Yorke) v Frampton and anr (R Hewlett)
 C P 131 Page (W W Young) v Parnall and anr (Clapham and Fitch; Aldridge, T and M)
 Q B 132 Tibble (H. Emerson) v Shaw (West, K. A. and Co)
 Ex 133 Fairlough (W Rogers) v Porker (Eardley, Holt and Co) SJ
 Q B 134 Bruges (M Abrahams and R) v Lewis and anr (Hollams, Son and Co) SJ
 C P 135 Chalmers (J Whitehouse) v Chalmers and anr (Nelson, Son and H), commission
 C P 136 Noad (E Sweeting) v Murrow and anr (Keene and M; G and W Webb) SJ
 Ex 137 Coleman (Green and P) v Desmond (W H Lane)
 Q B 138 Whiteley (C M Roche) v Nunn (J D Blake)
 Ex 139 Ring (H W Lindus) v Moore and anr (Saffery and H; Marchant and P)
 C P 140 King and Co (Digby and L) v Gibbs (J M Upfill)
 C P 141 Elsworth (G Davis Morgan and C) v Bassil and ors (C Parke)
 Q B 142 Birdsey (C V Field) v Bull (S T Cooper)
 Ex 143 Williamson (G M Cooke) v Hyatt (Nicoll, Son and T)
 C P 144 The Hale Macdonald Van Rocket Co (R Metcalfe) v Williams and Son and ors (C A Swaine)
 Q B 145 Trench (Brandons) v Matthews and Sons (Harcourt and M)
 Ex 146 Freehold Villas Trust, lmd (H C Barker) v Clarke (Lewis and L), stayed
 Q B 147 The Queen (Lewis and L) v Bandmann (W H Chatterton) SJ
 C P 148 Eyre (In Person) v Cutler (A E Copp) SJ
 Ex 149 Harvey and anr (Wood, L and B) v Bridgman and anr (G Badham) SJ
 Q B 150 Smith (Church, Sons & C) v Newman and ors (W T Ricketts)
 Q B 151 Same (Same) v A Newman and ors (Same)
 Ex 152 Hahn (A G Ditton) v Smart (Lewis, M & Co) SJ
 C P 153 Daun and anr (Wright, B and W) v Simmins (Lewin and Co)
 Q B 154 Metropolitan Railway Co (Burchells) v Cooke (Miller, S and B)
 Ex 155 Cooke (W H Roberts) v Hawkins (T Beard and Son)
 Q B 156 Sack (Haigh and A) v Lion (Angell and Terry)
 Q B 157 Page (Paddison, Son and T) v The Paris Skating Rink Co, lmd (Combe and W)
 Ex 158 Searle and Co (J Davis) v Benham (J H Waring)
 C P 159 Croizet (M Webb) v Frost and ors (Deacon, Son and R) SJ
 Ex 160 Wright and Co (Robinson and P) v Rowatt and Son (Woolf and C) SJ
 Ex 161 Talbot (H Smith) v Thomas (Miller and Sons)
 Chy 162 Globe Marine Insurance Co, lmd (Walton, B and N) v Stiebel Bros (Hollams, Son and C) SJ
 Q B 163 Whiteley (C M Roche) v Darley (T W Parkes)
 Ex 164 Tappenden (Robinson and P) v Tappenden (R F Finnis)
 C P 165 Parrott (Pawle, P and C) v Lovegrove (G B B Norman) SJ
 C P 166 Ziboli (T Frame) v Bettini and wife (W F Nokes)
 C P 167 Vestry of St Luke, Middlesex (W W Hayne) v Unwin and ors (F J and G J Brakenridge; Whateley, Milward and W) SJ
 C P 168 Cuthbert and anr (H R Silvester and Co) v Powis and Co (Combe and W)
 C P 169 Roland (Stoneham and L) v Metropolitan Ry Co (Burchells) SJ
 C P 170 Emma Silver Mining Co, lmd (F W Snell and G) v C F Kemp, Ford and Co (J H Johnson) SJ
 C P 171 Bannatyne (Wilson, B and C) v The Western Brazilian Telegraph Co, lmd (Bischoff, B and B) SJ
 C P 172 Gray (Benn Davis) v Bristol (King and Mc Millan)
 Ex 173 O'Brien (F O'Brien) v Powell (Freeman and B)
 Ex 174 Schwarack (W O Reader) v Fordran (J C Campbell)
 Ex 175 Pomeroy (J J Harlow) v O'Callaghan (J Holder)
 Ex 176 Curtis (W Eley) v Rudkin (H E Mooslen)
 Ex 177 Weir (Robinson and R) v Bone and anr (J H Waring) SJ
 Ex 178 White, admr (H G Powell) v Ward (Haynes and Son)
 Ex 179 Hill (Curtis and B) v Bertram and anr (Travers Smith and B)
 C P 180 London and County Bank (Trollope and W) v Hollings and anr (C Thorp)
 Q B 181 Simpson (A J Murray) v Dent (Crook and S)
 Q B 182 Caele (J Cotton) v Farrant (F W Smith) SJ
 Q B 183 Clarke (Patt and S) v Manila Yengarie Co, lmd (Taylor, H and T)
 Ex 184 Garrett and ors (Routh, S and C) v Taylor (S Scott)
- Q B 185 Ham (S Mayhew) v Tussaud (Walker and B)
 C P 186 Shipton (J J Solomon) v Chapman and anr (J Davis)
 Q B 187 Picken (R G Chipperfield) v M A Sander (G Johnson)
 Q B 188 Same (Same) v E Sander (Same)
 C P 189 Mutual Loan Fund Association (W Beard) v Knowles
 Q B 190 Brown (S B Simpson) v Tindale (Jno Scott)
 Q B 191 Lee and Co (W S Warrington) v Tibbe and Son (In person)
 Ex 192 Baker (Venn and W) v Pott (Pyke, I and P)
 Q B 193 Japanese Curtain and Patent Fabric Co, lmd (Courtenay and C) v Wood (T W Parkes)
 Chy 194 Flint (Valpy Chaplin and Co) v De Morgan (E Kimber)
 Chy 195 Cowper (Same) v Same (Same)
 Ex 196 Dear (Parker and B) v Cadogan and Hans Place Estate, lmd, and Ritherdon (Webster and G), without jury
 Q B 197 Forster (Brandons) v Lister (Keene and R)
 Ex 198 Fritchard (W Jarvis and T) v Mc Mahon (Risdale, C and R)
 Ex 199 Munro (J H Jones) v Morris (Speer and Son)
 C P 200 Stuart (Miller, S and B) v Davies (Cordell, G and B) SJ
 C P 201 Corder (W P Moore) v Rowley, bart (B W and P Powys)
 Q B 202 Grant (D Smyth and Briatow) v Clayton and ors (Lewis and L)
 Ex 203 Shillingford, trading, &c (H Smith) v Earl Desart (Horn and M) SJ
 C P 204 Channon (R Charles) v Ward (R K Bartlett)
 Q B 205 Hewetson (Kynaston and G) v Whittington Life Assurance Co (Taylor, H and T), commission
 Ex 206 Peiter (S Mayhew) v Sinclair (Winter, Williams and Co)
 Chy 207 Pease (Lowless and C) v Nash (Rooks and Co)
 Q B 208 The Mutual Society (Linklater, H A and B) v Mirams (E Mirams)
 Ex 209 Duminy (R S Taylor and Son) v Cooke and anr (Harcourt and M) SJ
 Ex 210 Arnold (A W Sadgrove) v Hoare and anr (Hyde, T and M)
 C P 211 Bebb and Wife (O C Kent) v Tooth and ors (G J Eady) SJ
 C P 212 Dows and anr (J J Hutchinson) v Davenport (Fritchard, - and A)
 Q B 213 The Queen (Lewis and Lewis) v Dilke (Whateley, M and Co) SJ
 C P 214 Witham (Jacobs and V) v Cutler and anr (Linklater and Co) SJ
 Ex 215 Lichigaray (W G Colley) v Waxin and wife (W S Fox)
 Q B 216 Ochse (Green and C) v Powell (Lewis and L)
 Q B 217 Case (Emanuel and Co) v Poole (Gregory and Co)
 Q B 218 Robertson (D Smyth and Bristow) v Labouchere (Lewis and L) SJ
 Q B 219 Cave (Same) v Levasseur (Plunkett and L)
 Ex 220 Hunter (Berry and Binns) v Lord George Hamilton (White and Co) SJ
 C P 221 Lane (T M Jenkins) v Jones (Evans and E)
 Ex 222 Parsons (H Tyrell) v Strousberg (A E Edwards)
 Ex 223 Wade (Nisbet, R and D) v Curtis (Gellatly, Son and W)
 Q B 224 Sneyd (Gregory and Co) v Pitterton (Milne, R and Co)
 Q B 225 Corpus Christi College (Williams, J and W) v Rogers (Lewis and L)
 Q B 226 Cox (E and F Bannister and F) v Ashton and ors (Hunter and D)
 Ex 227 Baird and Co (Morton and C) v L and N W Ry Co (Clark, W and Co) SJ
 Ex 228 Spens (Young and T) v Cracknell (H Smith)
 Q B 229 Hawkins (Milne and Co) v Williams and ors (J J Rae)
 Q B 230 Marriott (Webster and G) v Esdrail and Co (Shepherd and Sons)
 C P 231 Smith (Howard and Co) v Haverson (E H Parnell)
 Ex 232 Le Patourel (Sutton and Co) v Lavies (Barnard and Co)
 Q B 233 Bennett (W E Baxter) v England and ors (In Person; W F Sokes)
 C P 234 Castle (F T Newbould) v Austin (Morgan and Gilks)
 Q B 235 Hale (Layton, Son and L) v Gover (Duffield and B)
 Q B 236 Bridgman and ors (G Badham) v Hale (E Norton)
 Q B 237 Vowles (H May) v Rubridge (Dod and L)
 C P 238 Burke (J A Parry) v The South Eastern Ry Co (W R Stevens)
 Ex 239 Leuty and ors (J T A Patrick) v Foakes and ors (Freeman and B)
 C P 240 Livermore Bros (F W Mount) v Gamble and Son (Wynn)
 Ex 241 Kersey (Sandom, K and K) v Job and anr (C Mossop; E Hughes)
 Q B 242 Lees (Wedlake and L) v Scottish Union Insurance Co (Young, Jones and Co) SJ
 Ex 243 Blyth (H W Davis) v Powell (C Mossop)
 Q B 244 Marriott (Webster and G) v Crispe (H Earle)
 Ex 245 Hill (G Walker) v Reynolds (S Tripp)
 Q B 246 Edwards (A Carr and Son) v Martin and anr (Poole and H)
 Q B 247 Hugall (Sheppard and R) v Bervis (C F Yorke)
 Ex 248 Offord (T Johnson) v Cook (Beyfus and B)
 Q B 249 Hall (W Rutter) v Reeves (Alopp and Co)
 Q B 250 Burbridge (Bellamy and Co) v Harrington (Parker and Co)
 C P 251 Hildyard (W Maynard) v Lee (In Person)
 Q B 252 Sharpe (T Noton) v Metropolitan District Ry Co (Baxter and Co)
 Ex 253 Loates (Gregory and Co) v Harlinge (Hunter and D)
 C P 254 Sexton (Howard and Co) v Bainbridge (S Tripp)
 C P 255 Hallett (J S Kiech) v Wray (Lewis and L)
 Q B 256 Litton (Richardson and S) v Labouchere (Same) SJ
 Ex 257 Johnston (F J and G J Brackenridge) v Norton and anr (Mackeston, T and A)
 C P 258 Bowles (W Maynard) v Baker (Tillard and G)
 C P 259 Lambournsain (E Pooley) v Ramsay (G J Batton)
 Q B 260 Elers and ors (Coope, K and C) v Hare (Hollingsworth, T and A)
 Q B 261 Wallis (Combe and W) v London and South Western Ry Co (W H Hall)
 C P 262 Belham and anr (W Day) v Matthews (W Stollard)
 C P 263 Tronp, trading, &c (A W May) v Pocock (Young, J and B)
 Q B 264 Foster (D Keane) v Tucker (Tucker and L) SJ
 Q B 265 Gendley (H Philbrick) v London and County Banking Co (Seavey and H) SJ
 Q B 266 Popperell (S Tripp) v Marquis of Townshend (W A Day)

- Q B 267 Leader (J Aldridge) v Knight and anr (W Maynard) SJ
 Chy 268 Campagna Commerciale Italiana and anr (Parker and C)
 v Hancock and ors (Venn and W; H A Dowse) SJ
 C P 269 Lawrence (Walker, T B and W) v Watson (E Norton)
 Q B 270 Gunterbuck (in person) v Gibbs and ors (Cunliffe, B and D)
 Q B 271 Maslen (Pike and Son) v Lunnon (B Hope)
 Ex 272 Hartnoll (W F Newve) v Gamble (A H Miller)
 Q B 273 Allsop (T D Dutton) v King (T S Ashwin)
 C P 274 Treadwin (W R Philip) v Nunn (J D Blake)
 Ex 275 Gregory (Goldring & J) v Gregory (G Reader)
 C P 276 Bishop (G F Gray) v Cuff (J and H R Gill)
 Ex 277 Baxter (Hume, B and H) v Hodge and ors, sued, &c (Childs
 and B) SJ
 Ex 278 Gilding and anr (Shaan and C) v Pinn (Wontner and Son)
 SJ
 C P 279 Prage (M Bradford) v Frias (Deane, C and Co)
 C P 280 Elliot (Oliver and B) v Lawson and anr (J W Hickin) SJ
 C P 281 Funge and anr (J H Child) v Nunn (J D Blake)
 C P 282 Chapman (Cole and J) v Hayes (W E Morris)
 C P 283 Arnes and anr (T A Romer) v Bird (F Richardson and B)
 SJ
 Q B 284 Wood and ors (G T Powell) v Hitching and anr (Evans and
 E)
 C P 285 MacGregor (J M Uppill) v Morgan (J H Lydall)
 Ex 286 Holbrook (Smith and H) v North Metropolitan Tram Co (H
 C Godfrey) SJ
 Q B 287 Procter (J Seal) v Dunham (Pitman and L) SJ
 Ex 288 Dear (Parker and B) v Steer (J P Woulfe)
 C P 289 Litoun (B J Abbott) v Richtering (W Morley)
 C P 290 Watson (Same) v Lark (W R Preston)
 Ex 291 Cooper, trustee, &c (Lewis, M and L) v Milgrove (H Emer-
 son)
 Ex 292 Trelman (W Eley) v Edwards (A Kerly)
 Ex 293 Sharland (Crosse, Sons and R) v Mash (Rooks and Co)
 Q B 294 Watrliow and ors (H T V Philpott) v Best (Lewis and I)
 Q B 295 Russell (Lewis and Lewis) v The Association of Land Finan-
 ciers, lmd (Edy and Co)
 Q B 296 Medley (Same) v Stewart and ors (Ashurst M and Co) SJ
 Ex 297 Bodger (W E Duncan) v Friend (W Moon)
 C P 298 Winks (C J Mullens) v Barker and Co (Lowless and Co)
 Ex 299 Poolman (W T Boydell) v Gaffin (Willoughby and Cox)
 Q B 300 Allhuson (Shum, C and Co) v Labouchere (Lewis and Lewis)
 SJ
 C P 301 Archer (T W Parkes) v Stephens and anr (Peckham and
 Co)
 Q B 302 Duffley and ors (F W Smith) v Stevens (H Harris)
 Ex 303 Heigham (Webster and G) v The Licensed Victuallers and
 General Plate Glass Insurance Co, lmd (H Fox)
 C P 304 Balding (H R Silvester and Co) v Wells (Hicklin and W)
 Ex 305 Booker (Paterson, Sons and G) v Wadman (R Wills)
 Ex 306 Steele and ors (Stone, M & S) v The Vestry of St Leonard
 Shoreditch (Mills, L and M) SJ
 Q B 307 Hill and Wife (Munton and M) v The London and North-
 Western Ry Co (R F Roberts) SJ
 Ex 308 Petty (G J and P Vanderpump) v The Great Northern Ry
 Co (Nelson, B and S)
 C P 309 Willis (S Toppin) v Smith (E Lee)
 Ex 310 Thomas (J C Button and Co) v Hoar (Cheslie and B)
 Q B 311 Fellows (J Emanuel and Co) v Hickman and anr (J & R
 Gole) SJ
 Ex 312 Haupt (Cann and Son) v Anspach (Boulton and Son)
 Ex 313 Brown (Gare and Son) v Turner and Son (Norris, Allen
 and Co) SJ
 C P 314 Cox (H Clarkson) v Child (Stevens and Co)
 Ex 315 Shaw and anr (Crouch and E) v Thomas and anr (C H
 Finch)
 C P 316 Newcombe (S Edwards) v Dillingham (J Popham)
 Q B 317 White and ors (Paine, L and C) v Maley (W Norris)
 C P 318 Rees and ors (Prior, B C and A) v Morris and ors (J Girdle-
 stone)
 Q B 319 Collins (E Lowther) v Whetstone (G Prosswell)
 Ex 320 Dean (J C Fisher and Co) v Hobson (Beyfus and Co)
 Ex 321 Gielgud (Wilkins, B and F) v Sheppard and ors (F S Her-
 bert)
 Q B 322 Hill and anr (Satchell and C) v Smith (G B B Norman)
 Q B 323 King (Bellamy, Strong and B) v Sandeman and ors (Mor-
 ley and S; Sutton and O; V Musgrave)
 C P 324 Bramley-Moore (Paterson, Sons and G) v Spink (A E
 Francis)
 C P 325 Young and ors (E Newman) v Gilson (E E Winer)
 Ex 326 Martin (Coopers) v Blakelov Colliery Co (Carriz and Son)
 C P 327 Merritt (Kinch, Son and H) v Rogers and anr (H M Jull)
 C P 328 Householder (Galmoye and P) v Sargeant (E Mirams)
 Q B 329 Watkins (J Langdon) v Gordon (J S Kisch)
 Ex 330 Hollicorne (Goldring and Co) v Cooke (Harrisons)
 Ex 331 Lord Lonsborough and anr (Benbow & S) v The Royal
 Aquarium, &c, Society, lmd (F Richards and S) SJ
 C P 332 Fajkmaier (Norton, E N and B) v Fothergill and anr
 Hollama, Son and C; Field, Roscoe and Co) SJ
 C P 333 Fowke (S T Cooper) v Wells (in person)
 C P 334 Nicholls (Cordwell and Co) v Augerstein (J J Solomon)
 Q B 335 Roffee (H Ede) v Roscoe and anr (Morley and S)
 Ex 336 Page (Hason and T) v Kerridge (Bridges, S and Co)
 C P 337 Fontaine (Faithful and Co) v Metropolitan District Ry Co
 (Reuter and Co)
 Ex 338 Richards and ors (Learoyd, L & P) v Turner and anr
 (Willis and Watts)
 Q B 339 Markwick (G Thompson) v Cortis (A S Edmunds) postnd
 Q B 340 Same (Same) v Wickham (Same)
 Q B 341 Sterne, admix (J W Heritage) v North London Ry Co
 (Paine, L and C)
 Q B 342 Moody and anr (Lewis and Lewis) v Fisher (J Donaghe)
 Ex 343 Cooper (S W Cooper) v Gorton and Southdown Gas Co
 (A F Barnes)
 Q B 344 Shuckley Banking Co (Wellake and S) v Cordwell (New-
 man and Co)
 Ex 345 Botes (H W Christmas) v Williams and anr (G and A
 Lindo)
 Ex 346 Kerr (Goldring and J) v Lywood (Ford and F)
 Ex 347 Sheppard and anr (A W Gibbons) v Mumford (Bridger and
 C)
 C P 348 Gubb (Noun and C) v London and North-Western Ry Co
 (R F Roberts) SJ
 Q B 349 Ellice (G R Harrison) v Neal (in person)
 Ex 350 Bird (Goldring and J) v Fane (H H Hughes)
 Ex 351 Judge (Same) v Same (Same)
 Ex 352 Woodley (Same) v Same (Same)
 Ex 353 Clifford and anr (W Reeve) v Lowe and ors (W Evans) SJ
 Ex 354 Windas and anr (Lyne and H) v Caldwell (Hogan and H)
 Ex 355 Lynde and anr (Norris, Allen and Co) v Hunt (A West)
 C P 356 Shepherd (W Noun) v Bishop of Winchester and ors
 (Bolton and Co; Few and Co; Markby and Co; D W
 Logie; Saffery and H; Blake and S; Keighley and Co)
 SJ
 Ex 357 King and Co (Rollitt and Sons) v Mayor, &c, of Leamington
 (H Tyrell)
 Ex 358 Collins (Gardner, Son and W) v London and South-Western
 Ry Co (M H Hall) SJ
 Chy 359 Fothergill and ors (Lyne and H) v Hankey and ors (Hol-
 lams, Son and C) SJ
 C P 360 Williams (W T Manning) v Hutton (Lewis and Lewis)
 Ex 361 Fox and anr (Watney, T and F) v Kingley (W Scadding)
 SJ
 C P 362 Young and ors (S Newzman) v Wilson (Stevens and B)
 SJ
 Ex 363 Daniels (Parker and B) v Brooker (W Beck)
 C P 364 Winn (A G Dittion) v North Metropolitan Tram Co (H C
 Godfrey) SJ
 Q B 365 Shepherd (Same) v Same (Same) SJ
 Q B 366 Rule (Same) v Braid and Co (Tyrell and H)
 Ex 367 Lambert and wife (Beyan and D) v The South-Eastern Ry
 Co (W R Stevens)
 Q B 368 Scott (A Peachey) v Tooth (Emslie, F and S)
 Q B 369 Lucas (F A Foster) v Allen and ors (H W Christmas)
 Q B 370 Harrison (J E Lickford) v Hopkinson and anr (W Morley;
 Bennett and Co)
 Ex 371 Emanuel and Sons (Harris and G) v Burnand (Jones and
 S)
 C P 372 Palmer (A Hicks and Arnold) v Potter and anr (Tippett,
 Son and T)
 Q B 373 Westripp (H Hutchinson) v Wood, administratrix (T R
 Apps)
 Ex 374 Lee (T R Apps) v White (Ellis and Co)
 Ex 375 Hall (Denton, H and B) v Dunlop (Hare and F)
 C P 376 Jeffery (J Geaussen) v Harper (Thompson and D)
 Ex 377 Dunster (B F Watson) v Price and anr (Cree and Son;
 Philpot and Son)
 Ex 378 Bennett (Taylor, H and T) v Guyer (Sandilands and Co)
 Q B 379 Gower (Shum, C and Co) v Evans (Brook and C)
 Ex 380 Collett (W H Hudson) v Russell (W Webb)
 Ex 381 Champion (Duignan and S) v Walter (Purkis and P)
 Ex 382 Minner (Sweetland) v Wilkinson (Marsden and D)
 Ex 383 Eyo (R T Tadman) v Sladden Bros and Co (Darley and C)
 Ex 384 The Broomhall Tile and Brick Co, lmd (Gaden and T) v
 Cheesman and Co (Clarke and C)
 Ex 385 Wenden (Cosedge and C) v Fitch (Purkis and P)
 C P 386 Smith (G S Finch) v Chamberlain and anr (W Easton)
 Ex 387 Biffa (Bicknell and H) v Eames (T W Buckler)
 Ex 388 Pritchett (G J Jennings) v Perry and Co (Lewis, M and I)
 Q B 389 Slaughter (Hicklin and W) v London Tramway Co (H C
 Godfrey) SJ
 Q B 390 Hudson (Billing and K) v Budds (Sandem, K and K)
 Q B 391 Greig (H H Hughes) v Salting and ors (Flowers and S)
 Ex 392 Faulstich (W B Dunn) v Chubb and anr (Venn and W)
 Q B 393 Cloughton (Rooks and Co) v Robshaw (W A Downing)
 Ex 394 Dewar and anr (W Eley) v Tinker and anr (Rollit and J)
 Ex 395 Chattell (Austen, De Gex and Co) v Toppin (J Curtis)
 Ex 396 Ellis (W H Tattam) v Kocis (A C Spaul)
 Ex 397 Abalom (Austen, De Gex and Co) v Chignell and wife (E
 Woodard)
 Ex 398 Phillips (Emanuel and Co) v Watts (Stopher and Co)
 Ex 399 Woodward (Gregory and Co) v Hunt (Speechey and Co)
 Q B 400 Hamand (Fairfull and O) v Newport Pagnell Ry Co (Fowler
 and Co)
 C P 401 Bowler (J Bowen May) v Fleming (J Attenborough)
 Q B 402 Keight (Lane and A) v Hill (E W and B James)
 Ex 403 Murrell and anr (V J Chamberlain) v Heritage (F W Heri-
 tage and Co) SJ
 Ex 404 Thackrah (Rooks and Co) v Perry (H W Cattlin)
 Ex 405 Robinson and ors (Dawson and Co) v Hedgeland (Chapman,
 T and Co)
 Ex 406 Smith (in person) v Muir (E C Goldring)
 Q B 407 Mathieson (C O Humphreys and Son) v Paton (T Domi-
 thorne)
 C P 408 Turner and ors (Wills and W) v Benham (J H Waring)
 Ex 409 Pearl (T D Dutton) v Cross (Fisher, M and Co)
 Ex 410 Turner (Pattison, W and Co) v Moojen (Walter and M)
 Q B 411 Bodell (J Scoles) v Bagwell (H Rawlings)
 Ex 412 Eden and ors (Domville, L G and L) v Midland Ry Co (Bells,
 M and Co)
 Q B 413 Perry (Young and Sons) v Haupt (W T Ricketts)
 Ex 414 Lord Ranelagh (H Smith) v Taylor (Field, R and Co)
 Ex 415 Wenden (Cosedge and C) v Price (Purkis and P)
 Ex 416 Foxwell (A Hayes and Son) v Lon Gen Omnibus Co (H
 Stevens and H)
 Q B 417 Bick (J T H Sedaine) v Thorogood (Wontner and Sons)
 Q B 418 Jermyn (H Hughes) v North Metropolitan Tram Co (H C God-
 frey) SJ
 Q B 419 Ronalds (Thompson and D) v Brunaden (Woodbridge and
 Sons)
 Ex 420 Eakholme (Learoyd, L and P) v Badger (Bell, B and G)
 Q B 421 Nash (Lush and H) v Camp Bros (J B Hoombe)
 Q B 422 McDougall (Shell and G) v Copeland (Mercer and M) SJ
 Ex 423 Rogers (Duignan and S) v Ancona (Kummet and Son)
 Ex 424 Kent (Evans, F and B) v Ashburner (A E Francis)
 C P 425 Trollope (Trollope and W) v Mapleson (Gole and Co)

- Ex 426 Warne (G M Cooke) v Kaselack (W A Crump and Son)
 Ex 427 Ullathorne (F A G Powell) v Trueman (White, B and Co)
 QB 428 Harene (W and A R Ford) v Murdoch (Johnson, W B and A)
 Ex 429 McDougall Bros (G J Jennings) v Brodbeck (B W Nind)
 Ex 430 Hendrickx and anr (Tilley and S) v Compagnie Lafarmer
 Tabak and Cigaretterren and ors (Field, Roscoe and Co)
 SJ
 Ex 431 Howell, James and Co (Pheips, S and B) v Earl Desart
 (Horn and M)
 Ex 432 Lord C Ker (T A G Powell) v Tatersalls (Bailey, S and G)
 Ex 433 Upward (R W Cooper) v The West Middlesex Water Works
 Co (Same)
 Ex 434 Pelletier and Co (R S Taylor and Son) v Burgess (Pritchard,
 E and Co)
 Ex 435 Pelletier (Same) v Same (Same)
 QB 436 The Queen (Hughes, H and B) v Mayor, &c, of Falmouth
 (Gregory and Co)
 Ex 437 Wheeler and ors (Crowder, A and V) v The Bristol Port and
 Channel Dock Co (Whites, Renard and Co) SJ
 Ex 438 Oliver (G M Cooke) v Wright (Pearce and Son)
 Ex 439 Lake, trading, &c (S R Glyn) v Walbridge (E F B Harston)
 commission
 QB 440 Barker (Pearce and Sons) v Bishop (Learyoy, L and P)
 QB 441 Ridley (J Hopgood) v Tuck (Venn and W)
 CP 442 Styles (G E Carpenter) v Hart (Fisher and Co)
 CP 443 Waghorn (Same) v Paraire and ors (H Millman; H W Lin-
 dus; Venn and W)
 QB 444 Eilam (J Hopgood) v Groncock (Tilleard, G and H)
 CP 445 Phillips and ors (Stoneham and L) v Metropolitan Board of
 Works (R Ward) SJ
 CP 446 Roberts and Son (Peckham and J) v Savill Bros (Hillearys
 and J)
 QB 447 Ireland (J H Waring) v Kew (T M Jenkins)
 CP 448 Metcalfe (Boulton and Sons) v Wilson (Paterson, S and B)
 QB 449 Hale (Harrison, B and H) v Roberts (Janson, C and P) SJ
 CP 450 Stokes (T Wells) v Kromschroder (J S Lickorish)
 Ex 451 Lilly (W E Morris) v Brittain and anr (Sharpe, P and Co)
 QB 452 Markwick (G Thompson) v Bedford and ors (Ravencroft
 H and W)
 CP 453 Neil (Stokess and R) v Burden (Briggs and Co)
 QB 454 Wood (Clarke, R and C) v Fringle and anr, exors, &c (J
 and E Scott)
 QB 455 Dyer (J C Bulton and Co) v Samuel (Fraser)
 QB 456 Wood (A Wrakeford May) v Unwins and ors (F J and G J
 Braikenridge; in person)
 Ex 457 Green and anr (Green and C) v Partridge (Robinson and
 W)
 Ex 458 Watson and ors (J H Douglas) v Hodgson (Learyoy, L and
 P)
 Ex 459 Kavanagh (Bridges, S H and Co) v Blair and anr (Few and
 Co) SJ
 CP 460 Whitaker (J R Wood) v Brown (F Bradley), without jury
 CP 461 Trautman (Ellis and Crossfield) v Young (H Wickens)
 CP 462 Colquhoun (E A Swan) v Eden (G H Finch)
 Ex 463 Simmonds (G J Jennings) v North Metropolitan Tram Co
 (H C Godfrey)
 Ex 464 Wordsell (Paterson, S and B) v Callow (Lewis and Lewis)
 Ex 465 Hummell and ors (T A G Powell) v Verner (J Davis)
 QB 466 Uppington (D Keane) v Johnson (T R Apps)
 QB 467 Lovett (W F Morris) v Atlas and Waterloo Association
 (Lewis and Lewis)
 CP 468 Girardet (T R Watson) v Green and ors (J H Child)
 QB 469 Gooch (T Fortune) v Barnes (Prior, B and Co)
 CP 470 Willbridge (Dillon Webb, K and Co) v Hester (Beaumont
 and W)
 Ex 471 Mc Ewen (Pritchard, E and Co) v Pilkington (Phelps and
 S)
 Ex 472 Allison (E Warriner) v The Midland Ry Co (Beale, M and
 Co) SJ
 CP 473 Smith (T K Edwards) v Barrow (White and Sons)
 QB 474 Crown (J R Mayo) v Steele (Hicklin and W)
 Ex 475 Young (Rickards, W and M) v Scott (H Philbrick)
 QB 476 Davies (Gregory and Co) v Ruthwaite Bayrites Mining Co
 (Harrisons)
 Ex 477 Matthews and ors (Valpy, C and P) v Cooper (J W Few)
 Ex 478 Paget (R S Taylor and Son) v Kenway and ors (Lowless
 and Co)
 QB 479 Pickford (B E Greenfield) v Evans and anr (Robinson and
 P)
 Ex 480 Woodgate (Walker and M W) v Godfrey (J W Heritage)
 Ex 481 Mason (C G Rushworth) v Sunderland and anr (H Davis)
 Ex 482 Nunn (Blake and W) v Hemming (J Mo Dismid)
 Ex 483 Dodd (Sladen and M) v Hillel (Hurford and T)
 CP 484 Le Touseil (J Pullen) v Roy and anr (in person) SJ
 QB 485 Bradley and Co (H Levy) v Abbott (L Barnett)
 QB 486 Fletcher, admor, &c (J Jennings) v Huggett (Newman and L)
 CP 487 Arnaki and anr (W Bitham) v Lawrence (Parkers)
 CP 488 Finks and Co (F W Mount) v Wright (T Beard and Sons)
 Ex 489 Millan (Page and Son) v Beesty (Punkett and L)
 Ex 490 Atlantic Mutual Insurance Co (Stokes, S and S) v Huth and
 ors (Hollams, Son and Co)

When actions are settled out of court, the solicitors concerned are particularly requested to withdraw the pleadings, as great expense and uncertainty are occasioned to the suitors in other causes by the maintenance in the list of actions not intended for trial.

SALES OF ENSUING WEEK.

November 12.—Messrs. DRIVER & Co., at the Mart, at 2 p.m., freehold estate (see advertisement, October 19, p. 940).
 November 13.—Messrs. BMAL & SON, at the Portland Bazaar, Regent-street, sale of furniture (see advertisement, November 2, p. 10).

November 13.—Mr. STATHAM HOBSON, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., policies of assurance (see advertisement, this week, p. 40).
 November 14.—Messrs. C. C. & T. MOORE, at the Mart, at 1 for 2 p.m., freehold and leasehold estates (see advertisement, November 2, p. 10).
 November 14.—Messrs. NEWBON & HARDING, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., leasehold property (see advertisement, November 2, p. 10).

LONDON GAZETTES.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved

FRIDAY, Nov. 1, 1878.

Best, Charles, Thomas Horton, and Edward Henry Lee, Birmingham, Solicitors. Oct 31
 Gorton, Francis George, and Alan Stevenson de Fivas, Bedford row, Solicitors. Sept 27
 Milward, Robert Harding, Samuel Balden, jun, and Thomas Grosvenor Lee, Birmingham, Solicitors. Oct 30

TUESDAY, Nov. 5, 1878.

Burridge, William, jun., and John Hancock Cowsay, Wellington, Soli-
 citors. Oct 25
 Smyth, Thomas Henry, and John William Fletcher, Clegg at, O'dham, Solicitors. Nov 1

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

FRIDAY, Nov. 1, 1878.

British Seamless Paper Box Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented Oct 19, directed to be heard before the M.R. on Nov 3.
 Ramesden and Austin, Leadenhall st, solicitors for the petitioner
 Dulais Merthyr Colliery and Brick Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented Oct 28, directed to be heard before the M.R. on Nov 9.
 Rogers and Chave, Queen Victoria st, agents for Fussell and Co, Bristol, solicitors for the petitioners
 Metropolitan and Provincial Land, Building and Advances Association, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented Oct 24, directed to be heard before V.C. Mallins, on Nov 8.
 Brall, Queen Victoria st, solicitor for the petitioners
 Middlesex Brewery Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented Oct 10, directed to be heard before the M.R., on Nov 9.
 Treherne and Wolferstan, Ironmonger lane, solicitors for the petitioners
 Newport and South Wales Shipowners' Company, Limited.—By an order made by Mr. Justice Lush, dated Oct 23, it was ordered that the above company be wound up.
 Warriner, Great Winchester st, agents for Gibbs and Llewellyn, Newport, Mon, solicitors for the petitioner
 Nova Scotia Land and Manufacturing Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented Nov 1, directed to be heard before the M.R., on Nov 9.
 Tamplin and Co, Fenchurch st, solicitors for the petitioner

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

TUESDAY, Nov. 5, 1878.

Belper Laund Colliery Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented Nov 1, directed to be heard before V.C. Mallins, on Nov 15.
 Roberts, Coleman st, solicitors for the petitioners
 Calow Colliery Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented Nov 1, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall, on Nov 15.
 Roberts, Coleman st, solicitor for the petitioners
 Chollerford (Roman Wall) Hydropathic Establishment Company, Limited.—Creditors are required on or before Dec 5, to send their names and addresses and the particulars of their debts or claims to Joseph Robertson, King William st. Thursday, Dec 19, at 11, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims
 Hull and County Bank, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented Nov 4, directed to be heard before V.C. Mallins, on Nov 15.
 Edgar, Bucklersbury, solicitor for the petitioners
 Hull and County Bank, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented Nov 4, directed to be heard before the M.R., on Nov 16.
 Miller, Moor-gate st, solicitor for the petitioner

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

FRIDAY, Nov. 1, 1878.

Rusbon and North Wales Collieries Company, Limited.—By an order made by the V.C. dated Oct 25 it was ordered that the above company be wound up.
 Gill and Archer, Liverpool, agents for Ryland and Co, Birmingham, solicitors for the petitioners
 Rusbon and North Wales Collieries Company, Limited.—The V.C. has fixed Thursday, Nov 29, at 1.15, at his office, Municipal Office, Liverpool, as the time and place for the appointment of an official liquidator

TUESDAY, Nov. 5, 1878.

Chapeldown Paper Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented Oct 30, directed to be heard before the V.C., on Wednesday, Dec 4, at St George's Hall, Liverpool.
 Radcliffe, Blackburn, solicitor for the petitioner

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

TUESDAY, Nov. 5, 1878.

Bodelern and Coergenill Total Abstinence Friendly Society, Pass Man, Bodelern, Anglesey. Oct 31
 Piton Friendly Society, Piton National School. Oct 31

Bankruptcy.

FRIDAY, Nov. 1, 1878.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in London.

Willis, Robert, Great Cumberland place, Hyde Park. Pet Aug 23.
 Spring Rice. Nov 18 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Cole, Tum, Carlton Miniot, York, Horse Dealer. Pet Oct 28. Jefferson.
 Northampton, Nov 14 at 11
 Harris, Samuel, Laton, Bulwer. Pet Oct 30. Cooke. Laton, Nov 12 at 11
 Harvey, Thomas, Nottingham, Timber Merchant. Pet Oct 28. Speed.
 Nottingham, Nov 13 at 10.30

Parker, Alfred John, Milton Court rd, New Cross, Machine Printer. Nov 23 at 11 at offices of Moss, Gracechurch st.
 Parry, John, East Dean, Gloucester. Milkman. Nov 14 at 4 at Lion Hotel, Cinderford. Jackson, Straud
 Patrick, William, Graham, Washwood, Warwick, Baildr. Nov 16 at 11 at offices of Burton, Union pass, Birmingham
 Pausell, Alice, Basinghall st, Woolless Milliner. Nov 20 at 4 at offices of Birchall, Cowper's court, Corvill
 Pennigroth, Charles, Bradford, Music Dealer. Nov 15 at 10 at offices of Broughton, Kirkgate, Bradford
 Penny, Edward George, Newport, Monmouth, Auctioneer. Nov 14 at 11 at offices of Tomlinson, Dock st, Newport
 Philcox, Samuel Hastings, Picture Dealer. Nov 9 at 11 at offices of Mann, Rotherham, Hastings
 Phillips, James Edward, Hackney rd, Cabinet Maker. Nov 20 at 3 at offices of Ellis and Crossfield, Mark lane
 Potten, Thomas, Ewhurst, Samses, Farmer. Nov 14 at 12 at George Hotel, Battle, Sheppard
 Pouché, Charles Philip, Manse Terrace, Stoke Newington, Commercial Traveller. Nov 11 at 2 at offices of Payne, Finsbury pavement
 Rawlinson, John William, Huddersfield, Friarier. Nov 13 at 4 at offices of Barker and Son, Estate building, Huddersfield
 Ridsdale, George, Higher Boughton, Lancaster, Brickmaker. Nov 11 at 11 at offices of Ginkaway, Denngate, Manchester
 Ripper, Joseph, Bithams, Cornwall, Miller. Nov 16 at 2 at offices of Paul, Quay st, Truro
 Roberts, Thomas, Cwmyny Lower, Monmouth, Farmer. Nov 20 at 11 at offices of Hodges, Tiverton place, Aberystwyth
 Ross, Charles, Birmingham, Wine Merchant. Nov 14 at 3 at the Midland Hotel, New st, Birmingham. Fowke, Birmingham
 Roughton, John, Earlsdon, nr Coventry, out of business. Nov 13 at 11 at offices of Hughes and Massey, Little Park st, Coventry
 Russell, Thomas Edward, Wharfedale rd, King's Cross, Coal Merchant. Nov 11 at 2 at offices of Jones, Barnard's inn, Holborn. Bassett-Barnard's inn
 Ryler, Henry, Cheltenham, Physician. Nov 14 at 3 at offices of Preen, Regent st, Cheltenham
 Sellers, George, Bradford, Spindle Maker. Nov 7 at 11 at offices of Rhodes, Kirkgate, Bradford
 Shmied, John Tom, Leicester, of no occupation. Nov 12 at 11 at offices of Wigh, Gallowtree gate, Leicester
 Shore, Richard Cecil, Liverpool, General Produce Broker. Nov 21 at 2.30 at the L.W. Association Rooms, Cook st, Liverpool. Pemberton and Co, Liverpool
 Silver, Samuel Manick James, Hulme, Lancashire, out of business. Nov 14 at 3 at offices of Houner, Corporation st, Manchester
 Simpson, John, Lincoln, Butcher. Nov 13 at 11 at offices of Page, Jun, Flaxengate, Lincoln
 Smith, George, Fleming st, Kingsland rd, Cabnet Maker. Nov 13 at 2 at offices of Harvey and Co, Basinghall st. Davis, Basinghall st
 Smith, James Macquilliam, Keynasham, Somerset, Licensed Victualler. Nov 13 at 12 at offices of Benson, Broad st, Bristol
 Smith, John Bear, Conduit st, Paddington, Livery Stab's Keeper. Nov 14 at 3 at offices of Wright, Walbrook
 Stevens, Lawrence, and Frederick William Gardiner, Bristol, Building Contractors. Nov 12 at 1 at offices of Triggs, Broad st, Bristol. Deckenham, Bristol
 Stott, James, Over Darwen, Accountant. Nov 14 at 3 at the Old Bull Hotel, Blackburn. Polding, Blackburn
 Stutt, Joseph, Oxford, Baker. Nov 13 at 12 at offices of Bickerton, St Michael's chambers, Ship st, Oxford
 Sugden, William Singer, Exeter, Photographer. Nov 15 at 12 at the Bude Hotel, Exeter. Stanbury, Plymouth
 Swindells, George, Littleborough, Lancashire, Refreshment House Keeper. Nov 15 at 2.30 at offices of Brierley, But's avenue, Rochdale
 Tabe, William, Norwich, Wholesale Confectioner. Nov 14 at 12 at offices of Daly, Guildhall chambers, Upper Market, Norwich
 Thomas, William, Wauraridwydd, nr Swansea, Licensed Victualler. Nov 14 at 3 at offices of Woodward, Wind st, Swansea
 Timewell, Arthur Thomas, Clapham rd, Licensed Victualler. Nov 14 at the Law Institution, Chancery lane, in lieu of the place, originally named
 Townley, Thomas, Blackburn, Coal Merchant. Nov 15 at 11 at the White Bull Hotel, Church st, Blackburn. Easthorpe, Clitheroe
 Waldron, John, Winchester, Wine Merchant. Nov 11 at 3 at offices of Edmunds and Co, Chesapeake. Best and Scotney, Winchester
 Warlow, James Davies, Llanadwy, Pembroke, Shipbuilder. Nov 19 at 2 at the Bush Hotel, Pembroke Dock. Williams, Pembroke Dock
 Watson, Jonathan Hargrove, Southport, Plumber. Nov 13 at 3 at offices of Morris and Co, Lord st, Southport. Brook and Dikons, Southport
 Webb, William, Forest gate, Grocer. Nov 14 at 12 at offices of Fletcher and Co, Staple inn, Holborn
 West, James, and John West, Hindley, Lancashire, Cloggers. Nov 16 at 11 at offices of Lees, King st, Wigan
 Wynne, Ellen, Bethesda, Carnarvon, Grocer. Nov 13 at 2 at offices of Roberts, High st, Bangor

TUESDAY, Nov. 5, 1878.

Allmon, Martha, Skinningrove, York, Innkeeper. Nov 15 at 11 at offices of Jackson and Jackson, Albion rd, Middlesborough
 Archer, Silas, Darlington, Grocer. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Rowlands, Corporation chambers, Ann st, Birmingham
 Bedcock, Albert, Cranbrook, Kent, out of business. Nov 20 at 11 at the Railway Hotel, Staphord. Drew, Deal
 Biddleley, Samuel, Frolegate, Fuzess, Clerk. Nov 16 at 11.30 at offices of Drarie, Terminus rd, Eastbourne
 Baker, William Thomas, Bridgewater, out of business. Nov 19 at 12 at offices of Ward, Abion chambers, Broad st, Bristol
 Barlow, Robert, Newport, Cheshire, Licensed Victualler. Nov 20 at 11 at the Lion and Swan Hotel, West at, Congleton. Garside
 Barrett, Aaron, Hanbury at, Spitalfields, Grocer. Nov 13 at 10 at offices of Birgdenon, Wall st, Hackney
 Bell, Henry, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Fishmonger. Nov 12 at 11 at offices of Ashmole, Chesapeake, Hestley
 Bell, Thomas, Eastingwood, York, Farmer. Nov 22 at 3 at the Royal Oak Hotel, Thirsk. Richardson, Thirsk

Bell, John James, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Mineral Water Manufacturer. Nov 14 at 2 at offices of Hoyle and Co, Collingwood st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Bennett, Alfred William Gibson, Wandsworth rd, Billiard Table Maker. Nov 20 at 2 at offices of Cooper, Chancery lane
 Bennett, William Henry, Brighthelm, Col. in H.M.'s Auxiliary Forces. Nov 16 at 11.45, Chesapeake. Goodman, Brighton
 Bigg, Edward, Jun, Milton-next-Sittingbourne, Draper. Nov 15 at 3 at the Bull Hotel, Rochester. Mitchell, Rochester
 Boycott, John Noya, Over, Cheshire, Railway Station Master. Nov 15 at 2 at offices of Green and Dixon, Wimsford
 Bradbury, John, Macclesfield, Cheshire, Whitesmith. Nov 18 at 3 at offices of Barclay and Henstock, Exchange chambers, Macclesfield
 Bray, Richard, and Samuel Bray, Bolton, Coal Masters. Nov 16 at 11 at the Globe Hotel, Mount Pleasant, Bolton. Bowes, Bolton
 Brodhurst, Samuel, D'ackburn, Flock Dresser. Nov 18 at 3 at offices of Scott, Victoria st, Blackburn
 Brockies, Thomas, and Thomas William Brockies, Amella row, Spa rd, Bermondsey, Carriers. Nov 21 at 3 at offices of Tatham and Co, Queen Victoria st
 Brodbeck, John A'am, Globe rd, Mile End, Baker. Nov 18 at 4 at offices of Young and Sons, Mark lane
 Brook, Samuel, and George Ingham, Cleckheaton, York, Felt Manufacturers. Nov 18 at 2.30 at the Black Bull Hotel, Mirfield. Dean and Son, Batley
 Broke, George, Failand, Somerset, General Dealer. Nov 18 at 2 at offices of Milne and Co, Caledonian chambers, St Stephen's avenue, Clare st, Bristol. Fussell and Co, Bristol
 Brown, Elizabeth Ann, Accrington, Tobacconist. Nov 18 at 3 at the Railway Hotel, Accrington. Read, Barnay
 Brown, John Joseph, Railway st, York rd, King's cross, Boot Manufacturer. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Gessly, Westminster bridge rd
 Brown, Samuel, Heaton Norris, Lancashire, Clogger. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Brown and Alnsworth, St Petergate, Stockport
 Burridge, Alfred Short, Cardiff, General Dealer. Nov 19 at 11 at offices of Morris and Son, High st, Cardiff
 Caldecourt, William Henry, Man field place, Kenilworth town, Cricket Bat Manufacturer. Nov 18 at 3 at offices of Miles, King Edward st, Newgate st
 Caporn, William Pears, Coventry, Watch Manufacturer. Nov 18 at 12 at offices of Browett, Bayley lane, Coventry
 Chapman, William, Wolverhampton, Railway Detective. Nov 16 at 10.30 at offices of Barrow, Queen st, Wolverhampton
 Clarke, John Sanders, Gundle, Northampton, Surveyor. Nov 22 at 12 at offices of Richardson and Son, Oand's
 Cooper, Thomas Raynor, Kedgeley, Chemist. Nov 27 at 11 at offices of Smith, Petergate, York
 Crawford, Frederick Charles, Winton, Lancashire, Joiner. Nov 20 at 3 at offices of Doyle, Princess st, Manchester
 Crook, Richard Cole, Woolstone, Berks, Farmer. Nov 15 at 2.30 at the Swan Tavern, Farmington. Barns, Swindon
 Crouchley, Charles, Devonshire rd, Forest hill, Kent, Coal Merchant. Nov 22 at 3 at offices of Watson, 3 ulampton buildings, Folborn
 Danby, Richard, Brockmoor, Stafford, Iron Smeater. Nov 18 at 11 at offices of Price, High st, Stourbridge
 Dean, William, Formby, Lancashire, Joiner. Nov 18 at 3 at offices of Bartlett, Dale st, Liverpool
 Dennes, John, Lingfield, Surrey, Farmer. Nov 15 at 2.30 at offices of Pearls and Beeching, Tanbrdge Wells
 Domesr, James, Kingston-upon-Hull, Grocer. Nov 18 at 2 at offices of Gresham and Taylor, Parliament st, Hull. Foster and Co, Great Lifford
 Duddington, John, South Retford, Nottingham, Railway Clerk. Nov 22 at 11 at offices of Marshall, Chapel gate, East Retford. Metcalfe, East Retford
 Durrant, Edward, Kensingland, Suffolk, Fish Merchant. Nov 18 at 12 at offices of Chamberlain, Lowestoft
 Egan, John Milton, and Robert Hall, Little Tower st, Colonial Brokers. Nov 19 at 3 at offices of Wragg and Edwards, Great St Helens
 Elliott, John, Gateshead, Grocer. Nov 14 at 1 at offices of Turner, Grainger st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 English, Edward George, Middlesborough, Fruiterer. Nov 16 at 11 at offices of King, Wilson st west, Middlesborough
 Fern, John, Kingston-upon-Hull, Smack Owner. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Summers, Manor st, Kingston-upon-Hull
 Fieldsend, John Smith, Stainton-e-vale, Lincoln, Farmer. Nov 18 at 3 at the Townhall, Louth. Bull, Louth
 Fleming, John, Robert Melwith, and William Noel, Jun, Leadenhall st, Merchants. Nov 21 at 3 at the City Terminus Hotel, Cannon st. Murray and Co, Birchin lane
 Franklin, William, Sawbridgeworth, Hertford, Farmer. Nov 13 at 12 at offices of Unwin and Peggam, Sawbridgeworth
 Friend, Morris, Bathnal green rd, Cuthber. Nov 18 at 3 at offices of Swaine, King st, Chesapeake
 Gallop, William, Warrington, Master Fasten Cutter. Nov 19 at 11 at offices of Davies and Co, Market place, Warrington
 Geary, Alfred, Middlesborough, Ironmonger. Nov 14 at 11 at the Queen's and North Western Hotel, Birmingham. Robson, Middlesborough
 Gibb, Alexander, Barrow-in-Furness, Seedman. Nov 20 at 11 at the Ship Hotel, strand, Barrow-in-Furness. Pinessey, Barrow-in-Furness
 Glover, James, Oldham, Architect. Nov 21 at 11 at offices of Simpson and Hockin, Clegg st, Oldham
 Goswin, Frederick William, Romney, Hants, Coal Merchant. Nov 20 at 3, in substitution for Nov 4, at offices of Guy, Albion terrace, Southampton
 Grantham, James, Barrow-in-Furness, Grocer. Nov 14 at 11 at the Imperial Hotel, Barrow-in-Furness. Sims, Barrow-in-Furness
 Green, George, Southall, Warwick, out of business. Nov 18 at 2 at offices of Fallows, Cherry st, Birmingham
 Grice, Joseph, Wootton, Stafford, Potter. Nov 14 at 10 at offices of Tansand and Co, Chesapeake, Hestley
 Groves, Andrew, Wolverhampton, Builder. Nov 23 at 11 at offices of Green, Corporation st, Wolverhampton
 Hanilton, Joseph, Bradford, Coal Merchant. Nov 21 at 3 at offices of Tucker, York st, Manchester

Hammond, Robert Bills, and William Hammond, Birmingham, Jewellers. Nov 18 at 12.30 at offices of Sargent and Son, Bennet's hill, Birmingham

Halton, Richard, Great Malvern, Worcester, Draper. Nov 18 at 11 at offices of Piper, the Court House, Leobury

Haxley, Henry, Molesworth, Hunts, Coal Merchant. Nov 19 at 12 at offices of Richardson and Son, Thrapston

Heugh, John, Hugh Hengh, and Nicholas Sherwood Symons, Cannon st, Merchants. Nov 19 at 11 at the Lecture Hall, Athenaeum, George st, Manchester. Earle and Co, Manchester

Holmes, Henry, Normanton, York, Boot Maker. Nov 19 at 3 at offices of Gill and Hall, Silver st, Wakefield

Howard, William, South Benfleet, Essex, Corn Dealer. Nov 18 at 2 at offices of Payne, Finsbury pavement

Huddart, John, Charlotte st, Portland pl, Ball Dress Manufacturer. Nov 19 at 3 at offices of Pike and Minchin, Newgate st

Hughes, Robert, Liverpool, Coal Merchant. Nov 18 at 2 at offices of Goffey and North, Lord st, Liverpool

Hutchings, John, Altrington, Devon, Pig Dealer. Nov 15 at 16 at offices of Southcott, Old Post Office at, Bedford circus, Exeter

Inchcomb, Harry, Tunbridge Wells, Grocer. Nov 18 at 1 at the Creditors' Association of Wholesale Dealers, 4, Arthur at East. May and Co, Adelaide place, London Bridge

Jackson, Thomas, Ferry-moor, Selby, Farmer. Nov 18 at 2 at the Public Hall, Owsley, Ellis

Jarvis, Richard, Bromley Penanett, Stafford, Beer-seller. Nov 19 at 11 at offices of Waldron, High st, Brierley hill

Jones, John, Winsor Green, or Birmingham, Beer Retailer. Nov 15 at 10.15 at offices of East, Temple st, Birmingham

Jones, John, Ellemere, Selby, General Merchant. Nov 18 at 12 at the Wynnstay Arms Hotel, Wrexham. Giles

Kellott, Ralph, Monkwearmouth, Durham, Grocer. Nov 18 at 12 at offices of Shaw and Co, Fawcett st, Sunderland. Huntley, Sunderland

Kerwell, John, Marylebone rd, Wheelwright. Nov 14 at 3 at offices of Marshall, Bedford row

Knight, Thomas John, Chaplin terrace, Forest Hill, Iron Merchant. Nov 13 at 2 at offices of Hogan and Hughes, Martin's lane, Cannon st

Langford, William, Lyme Regis, Dorset, Builder. Nov 16 at 12 at the Bell Hotel, Axminster. Day, Bridport

Leason, Arthur, St. Luke-on-Trent, Stafford, Agent. Nov 14 at 11 at offices of Tennant and Co, Chesapeake, Hanley

Lewis, Charles Foulkes, Wrexham, Innkeeper. Nov 25 at 11 at offices of Morris, the Friary, Wrexham

Lewis, William, Neath, Glamorgan, Furniture Dealer. Nov 16 at 12 at offices of Charles, Parade, North

Lonsdale, William, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Fruiterer. Nov 19 at 3 at offices of Fleming, Grainger at West, Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Lonsdale, William, Leeds, Boot Manufacturer. Nov 13 at 11 at the Rarities Head, Bear lane, Leeds. Rhodes, Bradford

Lucas, John, Rother, Lanes-hire, Saddler. Nov 18 at 3 at offices of Hancock and Watson, Union st, Oldham

Lyons, James, jun, Sunderland, Builder. Nov 15 at 11 at offices of Watthew, West Sunnide, Sunderland

Madden, Denis John, Penobello rd, Notting hill, Tailor. Nov 14 at 12 at offices of Allcock, Ladbroke grove rd, Notting Hill

Mayhew, George, Charles st, Stepney, Provision Dealer. Nov 19 at 3 at offices of Wood, Basinghall st

Millward, William A Bert, Birmingham, Furniture Dealers' Assistant. Nov 14 at 10.15 at offices of East, Temple st, Birmingham

Mitchell, John, and Thomas Mitchell, Houghton, Cumberland, Horse Dealers. Nov 18 at 3 at the Bush Hotel, Carlisle. Hough, Carlisle

Monk, William James, and John Monk, Preston, Lancashire, Machinists. Nov 15 at 2.30 at offices of Charley and Finch, Fox st, Preston

Myers, Henry, Birmingham, Printer. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Fallows, Cherry at, Birmingham

Newson, Francis Nathaniel, Cambridge terrace, Hyde-park, Retired Captain. Nov 14 at 3 at offices of Fenton, Worship st, Finsbury

Nixon, James, Westminster Bridge, Licensed Victualler. Dec 2 at 3 at American's Hotel, Fleet st, Komptar

Norris, William, Watlington, Oxford, Baker. Nov 27 at 11 at offices of Jones, Shilhams st, Watlington

Owen, William, Eastwood, Nottingham, Dealer in Smallwares. Nov 19 at 12 at offices of Bell, Middle pavement, Nottingham

Parr, Josiah, Milton, Stafford, Builder. Nov 13 at 11 at offices of Heaton, Brickhouse st, Burslem

Payne, Henry, Sevenoaks, Kent, Boot Maker. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Knecker, London rd, Sevenoaks

Perry, John Cottrell, Bristol, Working Silversmith. Nov 30 at 11.30 at offices of Farnes, Victoria buildings, High st, Bristol. Tonkin, Bristol

Phelps, Paul, Shipston-on-Stear, Worcester, Clothier. Nov 22 at 10.30 at offices of Kirby and Mace, West at, Chipping Norton

Pilling, Richard James, Accrington, Lancashire, Tailor. Nov 18 at 12 at the George Hotel, John William st, Huddersfield. Holland, Blackburn

Poore, William, O'dbury, Worcester, Brickmaker. Nov 19 at 11 at offices of Forres, Chichester, O'dbury

Porter, Joseph, Sheepcote, Gloucester, Commission Agent. Nov 18 at 11 at the Grosvenor, Ely, Worcester at, Gloucester. Jackson

Poston, Thomas, Crews, Cheshire, Grocer. Nov 16 at 3.30 at offices of Foulton, Church side, Crews

Prentice, Richard George, Watford, Hertford, Oilman. Nov 18 at 12 at the Mason's Tavern, Mason's avenue, Basinghall st

Prentiss, Thomas, Pendleton, Lancashire, Contractor. Nov 12 at 2 at offices of Cobbett and Co, Brown st, Manchester

Quilham, Samuel, Liverpool, Sack Merchant. Nov 26 at 3 at offices of Gibson and Co, South John st, Liverpool. Frost, Liverpool

Ransom, William, Beverby, Brandy, York, Draper. Nov 18 at 11 at 118, High st, Stockton-on-Tees

Rassard, Isaac, Kingston-upon-Hull, Upholsterer. Nov 14 at 3 at offices of Leverock, Land of Green Ginger, Kingston-upon-Hull

Reaney, William, Longton, Stafford, Grocer. Nov 19 at 12.30 at offices of Addisley and Marlet, Commercial st, Longton

Richardson, Robert, Radon rd, Builder. Nov 18 at 12 at offices of Plunkett and Leader, St Paul's churchyard

Rippon, Jabez, Newbold Moor, Derby, Grocer. Nov 18 at 3 at the Star Hotel, Chesterfield. Stanton, Chesterfield

Roberts, William, Leicester, Book Manufacturer. Nov 22 at 3 at offices of Wright and Hinks, Leicester

Robinson, Frederick, Bath terrace, Trinity sq, Southwar k, of no occupation. Nov 18 at 12 at offices of Ditton, Ironmonger lane

Sarrott, Charles, Huntingdon st, Kingsland rd, Boot Manufacturer. Nov 25 at 2 at offices of Emden, Coloman at

Savage, Charles, Manchester, out of business. Nov 20 at 3 at the Falstaff Hotel, Market place, Manchester. Tremwen, Manchester

Scott, William, and Joseph Yair, Aldersgate st, Commission Merchants. Nov 11 at 3 at offices of Montagu, Bucklersbury

Sharp, Jerry, Hockwoodwike, York, Joiner. Nov 15 at 11 at offices of Styles, Ings grove, Hockwoodwike

Shields, William, Worckington, Cumberland, Joiner. Nov 19 at 11 at offices of Mason, Duke st, Whitehaven

Sherlock, William, Preston, Lancashire, Overlooker. Nov 18 at 3 at offices of Forshaw and Parker, Cannon st, Preston

Sinclair, David, Barnwell rd, Brixton, Iron Merchant. Nov 11 at 1 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st, Dudley, Queen at

Smith, George, Stourton Thwaite gate, nr Leeds, Blacksmith. Nov 18 at 3 at the Commercial Hotel, Albion st, Leeds. Horner, Wakefield

Smith, Robert William, Lower Broughton, Lancashire, out of business. Nov 18 at 2.30 at offices of Hogg, Market st, Manchester

Stoker, Alfred John, Surbiton, Surrey, Boot Manufacturer. Nov 27 at 2 at offices of George, Finsbury place. Hope, Euston rd

Taylor, James Henry, Hemsworth, York, out of business. Nov 18 at 3 at the Black Bull Inn, Batley, Lodge, Wakefield

Thackway, Thomas, Liverpool, Fruiterer. Nov 22 at 3 at offices of Blochurst and Fretton, Dale st, Liverpool

Thistlewood, George, William, Gosforth, Northumberland, Poultry Dealer. Nov 16 at 11 at offices of Bird, Grey st, Newcastle-upon-Tyre

Thomas, Albert Dolamore, Gloucester rd, Holloway, Builder. Nov 18 at 2 at offices of Woodfin and Wray, Finsbury circus

Thomas, Lavalin Robert Iilly, Tisbury, Pembroke, Gent. Nov 26 at 2 at the County Court Office, Pembroke Dock. Gwynne and Stokes, Tenby

Thompson, John, and Thomas Baines, Middlesborough, York, Ironmongers. Nov 18 at 11 at the Queen's and North Western Hotel, Birmingham. Robson, Middlesborough

Tingey, George Edward, Moss Sde, nr Manchester, Commercial Traveller. Nov 18 at 3 at offices of Edwards, Brassnose st, Manchester

Totman, Frederic, Wetherfield, Essex, Farmer. Nov 21 at 11 at the Horn Inn, Braintree. Hobbs, jun, Braintree

Urquhart, John, Barnsbury rd, House Decorator. Nov 18 at 12 at offices of Fletcher and Co, Staple inn, Holborn

Wainman, William, Marmaduke, Barnstaple, Devon, Photographer. Nov 19 at 11 at offices of Thorne, Castle st, Barnstaple

Walley, Thomas, Salford, Lancashire, Potted Meat Manufacturer. Nov 18 at 3 at offices of Nadin, Chapel st, Salford

Walters, Maria, Mare st, Hackney rd, Oilman. Nov 21 at 1 at the Creditors' Association, Arthur st, East. May and Co, Adelaide place

Watts, Alfred, Chipping Norton, Oxford, Basket Maker. Nov 23 at 11 at offices of Kirby and Mace, West at, Chipping Norton

Westcott, William, William Henry Westcott, and John Westcott, Barnstaple, Shipbuilders. Nov 16 at 11 at the Bridge Hall, Bridge chambers, Barnstaple. Thorne, Barnstaple

Wharton, John, and James Beachley, Bolton, Builders. Nov 20 at 11 at offices of Ryley and Haslam, Mawdsley st, Bolton

Whittingstall, Thomas, Ryde, I.W., Walter. Nov 20 at 3 at offices of Beckingsale, Logley st, Newport

White, Charles, Old Compton st, Soho, Hosier. Nov 18 at 12 at offices of Shearns, Gresham st

Whitham, Robert, Bradford, Stuff Manufacturer. Nov 18 at 11 at offices of Atkinson, Dale at Bradford

Wilkinson, James, Sheffield, Joiner. Nov 18 at 3 at the Incorporated Law Society, Alline court, High st, Sheffield. Smith and Co, Sheffield

Williams, Joshua Sutton, Pontypridd, Ironmonger. Nov 20 at 3 at offices of David, Tredegar place, Newport

Williams, Thomas, Birmingham, Grocer. Nov 15 at 2 at offices of Fallows, Cherry at, Birmingham

Wilson, John, Wolverhampton, General Dealer. Nov 19 at 11 at offices of Wilcock, Queen st, Wolverhampton

Wright, John, Watly, York, Cabinet Maker. Nov 18 at 3 at offices of Chadwick and Sone, Church st, Dewbury

Wyatt, William Bailey, Edgbaston, or Birmingham, Boat Builder. Nov 15 at 3 at offices of Fallows, Cherry at, Birmingham

Yearley, Mary Ann, Longton, Parian Manufacturer. Nov 13 at 11 at the Swan Hotel, Church st, Longton

Yield, Frederick, Carlisle, Banker's Clerk. Nov 15 at 11 at offices of Johnson, Scotch st, Carlisle

SCHWEITZER'S COCOATINA,

Anti-Dyspeptic Cocoa or Chocolate Powder.

Guaranteed Pure Soluble Cocoa of the Finest Quality, with the excess of fat extracted.

The Faculty pronounce it "the most nutritious, perfectly digestible beverage for Breakfast, Lunch, or Supper, and invaluable for Invalids and Children."

Highly commended by the entire Medical Press.

Being without sugar, spice, or other admixture, it suits all palates, keeps better in all climates, and is four times the strength of cocoa thickened yet weakened with starch, &c., and is REALITY CHEAPER than such Mixtures.

Made instantaneously with boiling water, a teaspoonful to a Breakfast Cup, constituting a healthy and delicious beverage.

COCOA-TINA & VANILLA is the most delicate, digestible, cheapest Vanilla Chocolate, and may be taken when richer chocolate is prohibited.

In tin packets at 1s. 6d., 3s., &c., by Chemists and Grocers.

Charities on Special Terms by the Sole Proprietors,

H. SCHWEITZER & CO., 19, Adam-street, London, W.C.

PAINLESS DENTISTRY.**MR. G. H. JONES,**

SURGEON DENTIST,

67, GREAT RUSSELL-STREET, BLOOMSBURY
(Immediately opposite the British Museum).

Will be glad to forward his new Pamphlet gratis and post-free, which explains the only perfectly painless system of adapting ARTIFICIAL TEETH (protected by Her Majesty's Royal Letters Patent), which have obtained five Prize Medals, London 1862, Paris 1867, Philadelphia 1876, Vienna 1873, and New York 1883.—Consultation daily free.

RESIDENTS ABROAD who are prevented visiting a qualified dentist can be treated on advantageous terms.

EDE AND SON**ROBE MAKERS**

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench Corporation of London, &c.

SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.

BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSEL'S DITTO.

CORPORATION ROBES, UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS, &c.
ESTABLISHED 1689.**94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.**

MR. GEORGE JOHNSON, 83, Colmore-row, Birmingham, is prepared to make immediate CASH ADVANCES upon every description of SECURITY.

MORTGAGE WANTED for £5,000 Trust-Money.
Will go upon freeholds or leaseholds.—Apply, by letter, to S.A.R. 23, Red Lion-square, W.C.

MONEY ADVANCED at a Day's Notice (from £50 upwards) to respectable householders in the London District upon MORTGAGE of their Furniture without removal, repayable by easy instalments. No charge of any kind unless money advanced. As this does not emanate from an agent, applicants must apply personally to Mr. BAUGHAN, 34, Southampton-buildings, Chancery-lane. The public are cautioned against paying preliminary fees to pretenders.

MONEY promptly Advanced on personal security.
Bills of Sale, Freeholds, Leaseholds, Stocks, Shares, Bonds, Life Interests, Annuities, Reversions, or other security, repayable by instalments. No preliminary fees.—REAL AND PERSONAL ADVANCE COMPANY (Limited). Established 1855. 3, Tavistock-street, Covent-garden.—J. WOOLLETT, Secretary.

MONEY. — LONDON AND WESTMINSTER
LOAN AND DISCOUNT COMPANY (Limited).—ADVANCES made without fees in sums of £10 to £300 on Personal Security, Deeds, Furniture, Bills of Sale, Foreign Stocks, Bonds, Reversions, and Life Policies. Prospectuses gratis, or sent on application. Offices, 61, St. Martin's-lane, London, W.C. CHARLES HILLS, Secretary.

TO SOLICITORS, BARRISTERS, ACCOUNTANTS, ARCHITECTS, INSURANCE OFFICES, PUBLIC COMPANIES, and Others.—Important suites of offices to let in that imposing building known as Lonsdale Chambers, No. 23, Chancery-lane, comprising sets of two, three, five, and eight rooms, and single room if desired, all lofty and well lighted, approached by noble staircase, and divided by well-arranged spacious corridors; building fire-proof; patent lift; every sanitary convenience. Night Watchmen. Strong rooms can be had.—Application to Mr. GEO. BECKETT, Surveyor, Estate Offices on the premises.

LAW EXAMINATIONS.—Preparations for Preliminary, Intermediate, and Final Solicitors', London University. Articulation, Arts, and Law Degrees, either by Class, Private Lessons, or Correspondence.—H. S. BOWEN, 4, Stone-buildings, Lincoln's-inn, W.C.

LAW EXAMINATIONS.—Mr. ALBERT ST. PAUL (M.A. Oxon), Solicitor, prepares gentlemen for their Preliminary, Intermediate, and Final Examinations, either privately, or in class. Resident pupils received.—Address, 11, Staple-inn, London, W.C.

MR. T. BATEMAN NAPIER, CLIFFORD'S-INN PRIZEMAN, Winner of the Law Society's ONLY SCHOLARSHIP, and CONVEYANCING GOLD MEDALIST, 1876, reads with Gentlemen for the PRELIMINARY, INTERMEDIATE, and FINAL Private Pupils. Honour Class taken separately. Students prepared through the post.

5, MYERS COURT BUILDINGS, KING'S BENCH WALK, TEMPLE, E.C.

ONE PENNY PER FOLIO. ABSTRACTS

ONE PENNY PER FOLIO. Bills of Costs.

ONE PENNY PER FOLIO. Briefs.

ONE PENNY PER FOLIO. Fair Copy.

HOOPER & SONS, 69, Ludgate-hill.

Second Edition, revised and enlarged, price 15s.

FOOD AND DIETETICS

Physiologically and Therapeutically considered. By W. F. FAY, M.D., F.R.S., Physician to, and Lecturer on the Practice of Medicine at, Guy's Hospital.

"A standard work of reference."—"Lancet." "A book of first-rate merit."—"Practitioner." "Very full and exhaustive throughout."—"Spectator." "A work with which every educated man ought to make himself familiar."—"Chemical News."

J. & A. CHURCHILL, and SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, & Co.

THE LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL, edited by JOHN INDERMAUR.

This new Journal for Law Students will be published 1st January, 1879, and continued monthly. Price 6d. Annual subscription 6s. post free. It will deal generally with subjects affecting Students for both branches of the profession, contains answers to Examination Questions, Articles, Essays, &c. Particulars of the scope and objects of the publication, scale of charges for advertisements, &c., sent post free on application. All communications to be addressed to the Editor, Office of the Law Students' Journal, 16, Curator-street, Chancery-lane, London.

LONDON GAZETTE (published by authority) and LONDON and COUNTRY ADVERTISEMENT OFFICE.

No. 117, CHANCERY LANE, FLEET STREET.

HENRY GREEN, Advertisement Agent, begs to direct the attention of the Legal Profession to the advantages of his long experience of upwards of thirty years, in the special insertion of all professional notices, &c., and hereby solicits their continued support.—N.B. One copy of advertisement only required, and the strictest care and promptitude assured. Officially stamped forms for advertisement and file of "London Gazette" kept. By appointment.

AN IMPORTANT CONVENIENCE TO LAW WRITERS AND SOLICITORS.

STEPHENS' SCARLET INK FOR STEEL PENS.

This new Ink supplies the demand continually made but never before met, for a Red Ink which is uninjured by Steel or other Metallic Pens. Steel Pens left in this ink for months do not impair the beauty of its colour, nor are the Pens in the least corroded by it. The existing Red Inks rapidly destroy Steel Pens, and lose their red colour, if used with other than Gold or Quill Pens. This new colour is a very rich scarlet red of great beauty. The colour of this ink is not affected by use upon parchment, and is consequently of great value to Solicitors and Draughtsmen.

Sold in stone bottles, retail at 1s., 2s., 3s.; and Imperial Quarts of 40 ounces at 6s. each. Also in glass bottles at 6d. and 1s. each.

PARTRIDGE & COOPER.

WHOLESALE AND RETAIL STATIONERS

192, Fleet-street, and 1 & 2, Chancery-lane, London, E.C.

Carriage paid to the Country on Orders exceeding 30s.

DRAFT PAPER, 5s., 6s. 6d., 7s. 6d., 7s. 9d., and 9s. 9d. per ream.
BRIEF PAPER, 15s. 6d., 17s. 6d., and 23s. 6d. per ream.
FOOLSCAP PAPER, 10s. 6d., 14s. 6d., and 18s. 6d. per ream.
CREAM-LAID NOTE, 2s., 4s., and 5s. per ream.
LARGE CREAM-LAID NOTE, 4s. 6d., 6s. 6d., and 8s. per ream.
LARGE BLUE NOTE, 3s. 6d., 4s. 6d., and 6s. 6d. per ream.
ENVELOPES, CREAM OR BLUE, 3s. 9d., 4s. 6d., and 6s. 6d. per 1000.
THE "TEMPLE" ENVELOPE, extra secure, 9s. 6d. per 1000.
FOOLSCAP OFFICIAL ENVELOPES, 1s. 9d. per 100.
PARTRIDGE & COOPER'S VELLUM WOVEN CLUB-HOUSE NOTE, 9s. 6d. per ream. This incomparable Paper has raised up a host of worthless imitations. Purchasers are particularly requested to observe that each sheet bears the fac-simile water-mark, "PARTRIDGE & COOPER'S VELLUM-WOVEN CLUB-HOUSE PAPER," without which none is genuine.
INDENTURE SKINS, Printed and Machine-ruled, 2s. 3d. each, 25s. per doz., 135s. per roll.
SECONDOS ON FOLLOWERS, Ruled, 2s. 1d. each, 24s. per dozen, 112s. per roll.
RECORDS OR MEMORIALS, 8d. each, 7s. 6d. per dozen.

Ledgers Day Books, Cash Books, Letter or Minute Books.
An immense stock in various bindings.

LIEBIG COMPANY'S EXTRACT OF MEAT.

A SLIGHT ADDITION OF THE EXTRACT GIVES GREAT STRENGTH AND FLAVOUR TO SOUPS, MADE DISHES, AND SAUCES, AND EFFECTS GREAT ECONOMY.

LIEBIG COMPANY'S EXTRACT OF MEAT.

Caution.—Genuine only with facsimile of Baron Liebig's signature in blue ink across label.

LIEBIG COMPANY'S EXTRACT OF MEAT.

In use in most households throughout the Kingdom.

LIEBIG COMPANY'S EXTRACT OF MEAT.

EGYPTIAN STATE-DOMAIN MORTGAGE BONDS.

Issue of £8,500,000 5 per Cent. Bonds.

HIS HIGHNESS THE KHEWIVE OF EGYPT, upon the proposition of his Council of Ministers and with the concurrence of the Commissioners of the Public Debt, having issued a Decree authorizing the above Loan, Mr. RIVERS WILSON, C.B., the Finance Minister of Egypt, has contracted with Messrs. N. M. ROTHSCHILD & SONS, of London, and Messrs. DE ROTHSCHILD BROTHERS, of Paris, for the issue of the Bonds.

Subscription Lists will be opened in London on Monday, the 11th November, and will be closed on Tuesday, the 12th November.

The price of issue is £73 for every £100 nominal capital, payable as follows:—

| | |
|-----|-----------------------|
| £5 | on application. |
| £15 | " allotment. |
| £20 | " 16th January, 1879. |
| £20 | " 17th April. |
| £13 | " 19th May. |

£73

The first half-yearly Coupon, due on the 1st June, 1879, will be attached to the Scrip. Payment in full may be made under discount at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum, on any Monday or Thursday after the Scrip has been issued.

The failure to pay either of the instalments will subject all previous payments to forfeiture.

Scrip will be issued, which, after payment of the last instalment, will be exchanged for the Bonds as soon as they are ready for delivery.

The Bonds, both principal and interest, will be payable in gold free from all Egyptian taxes; they will be issued to bearer in sums of £20, £40, £100, £200, and £1,000, with Coupons payable half-yearly on the 1st June and the 1st December, at the office of Messrs. N. M. ROTHSCHILD & SONS, London, in Pounds sterling; of Messrs. DE ROTHSCHILD BROTHERS, Paris, at the exchange of 25 frs. 25 cents. per pound sterling; and at Alexandria, at houses to be designated hereafter.

Application for the Bonds must be made in the accompanying form. In case the allotment should not require the whole deposit, the surplus will be returned; and if the deposit be insufficient to cover the first instalment on the amount allotted, the balance required must be paid forthwith.

In case of no allotment being made to the applicant the deposit will be returned.

Subscription Lists will be opened in London, Paris, Amsterdam, Brussels, &c.

The following is a translation of the decree mentioned above:—

WE, THE KHEWIVE OF EGYPT. Having, under date of the 23rd of August in the present year, accepted the resolutions contained in the report of the Committee of Inquiry, and having signified our said acceptance to its Vice-President, Mr. RIVERS WILSON, by our speech of the same day addressed to him and published in the *Moniteur Egyptien*.

And considering that the members of our family mentioned in the two lists supplied by us to the Committee of Inquiry have surrendered all their real property, that the same may be transferred to the State with the view of effecting a settlement of the financial condition of the Government on a stable and equitable basis: upon the proposition of our Council of Ministers, sanctioned by us, and with the concurrence of the Commission of the Public Debt, HAVE DECREED AND DECREE AS FOLLOWS:—

ARTICLE 1st.—In the name of the above mentioned members of our family, we hereby absolutely and in perpetuity transfer to the State all the real property belonging to them, and described in the third article hereof.

ARTICLE 2nd.—A loan for a nominal sum not exceeding £8,500,000 sterling shall be contracted for in the name of the State.

ARTICLE 3rd.—This loan will be secured on the property transferred by our family to the State and consisting of 425,746 feldans of lands and houses. The net revenue of the said lands and houses amounts altogether to £422,426 sterling per annum, according to the estimate in the lists given to the Committee of Inquiry.

ARTICLE 4th.—In case the revenue of the said property should not suffice to meet the amount required for the service of the loan, the deficiency will be covered by the general revenues of the Government.

ARTICLE 5th.—Our Council of Ministers is hereby authorized to agree to and make by the Finance Minister a formal mortgage on all the property transferred, as aforesaid, in favour of the contractors of the loan.

ARTICLE 6th.—In order further to secure the said loan, a Special Commission will be formed to administer the said property. The Commission will be composed of three members, an Egyptian, an Englishman, and a Frenchman; and it shall be under the direct control of the Council of Ministers.

The two foreign members will be appointed by us on the nomination of their respective Governments.

The functions of the said Administrators will be as follows:—

- (a) To manage the property.
- (b) To collect the revenues.
- (c) To remit all the net revenues to the contractors of the loan.

ARTICLE 7th.—Our Finance Minister is authorized to settle with the contractors the terms of the loan, and to arrange with respect to the application of the eventual surplus revenue of the said property.

ARTICLE 8th.—Our Finance Minister is charged with the execution of this decree.

Given at Cairo, this 20th day of October, 1878.

(Signed)

ISMAIL.

(Countersigned)

The President of the Council of Ministers,
NUBAR.

The following letters have been addressed to Messrs. Rothschild.

"SIR JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE TO BARON ROTHSCHILD, London."

FOREIGN OFFICE, October 22nd, 1878.

SIR,

I am directed by Lord Salisbury to inform you that the French Minister for Foreign Affairs, after communication with the house of M. M. Rothschild in Paris, has proposed to Her Majesty's Government that the Daira lands recently surrendered by the family of the Viceroy, which are to be hypothecated in security for the proposed Egyptian Loan, shall be managed by three persons, one of whom shall be an Egyptian, and the other two shall be nominated, one by the English and one by the French Government; and that the rents of the said land shall be collected and remitted to Messrs. Rothschild, so far as may be required to keep down the interest and sinking fund on the loan; and I am to say that Her Majesty's Government have assented to this arrangement.

The British Government do not accept any liability to pay in any contingency the interest on this Loan; but they undertake this nomination in order to provide to the creditors a security that the manager so nominated shall not be divested of his functions without their previous consent.

Baron L. ROTHSCHILD,
&c., &c., &c.

"M. WADDINGTON to BARON ROTHSCHILD, Paris."

I am, Sir, your most obedient humble Servant,
(Signed) JULIAN PAUNCEFOTE.

Paris, le 28 Octobre, 1878.

Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, Direction Politique.

Monsieur le Baron.—En vertu de l'entente établie entre le Gouvernement de S. M. Britannique et nous, les domaines dont le Khédive vient de faire abandon, en garantie de l'emprunt qu'il désire contracter, doivent être ad ministrés par une Commission spéciale composée d'un délégué Français, d'un Anglais, et d'un Egyptien; et il a été convenu, en outre, que les deux premiers seraient désignés par leurs Gouvernements respectifs. Cette Commission serait chargée de percevoir les revenus des biens que le Khédive a cédés, et de les remettre à M. M. de Rothschild jusqu'à concurrence de la somme nécessaire pour le service des intérêts et de l'amortissement de l'emprunt dont il s'agit.

J'ai l'honneur de vous faire savoir que l'accord entre le Gouvernement anglais et nous est complet sur ce point, mais comme lui, nous déclinons toute responsabilité relativement au paiement de l'intérêt de l'amortissement de l'emprunt projeté. Notre seul but est de fournir aux créanciers de l'Egypte l'assurance que le commissaire désigné par nous ne pourra être relevé de ses fonctions sans notre assentiment préalable.

Recevez, &c.

à Mr. le Baron de Rothschild à Paris.

(Signed)

WADDINGTON.

"Mr. T. V. LISTER to BARON ROTHSCHILD, London."

FOREIGN OFFICE, October 28th, 1878.

Sir,

I am directed by the Marquis of Salisbury to transmit to you herewith for your information a copy of a telegram dated yesterday which has been received from Mr. Lascelles, containing information as to the amount of the Rural as well as of the Urban property which has been ceded by the members of the Khedive's Family to the Egyptian Government.

I am, Sir,

Your most obedient humble Servant,
(Signed) T. V. LISTER.

BARON L. DE ROTHSCHILD,
&c., &c., &c.

(Enclosure.)

Copy of Telegram from Mr. LASCELLES, Cairo.

D
R 27 October, 1878.

Nubar Pasha requested that the following may be communicated to Mr. de Rothschild:—

Amount of Rural property ceded by Princes and Princesses of Khedivial family to Egyptian Government 425,729 feddans, 10 kirats, 12 sahm; amount of Urban property, also ceded, 16 buildings according to following letter from Cadi of Cairo.

A son Excellence le Président du Conseil des Ministres.

Les terres et immeubles, dont la quantité et le nombre sont ci-contre indiqués, sont devenus la propriété de Bet el Mal, dite Mers, en vertu des actes de donations à cessions légaux faits en faveur du Gouvernement (Miri), et acceptés par votre Excellence pour le Gouvernement. Ces actes ont été faits légalement par les premiers propriétaires devant le Conseil du Mekhemeh (Cherif) tenu au Palais d'Abdine en notre présence, et ont été enregistrés dans les registres du Grand Mekhemeh du Caire. Toutefois, 9,591 feddans et quelques fraction appartenant à la Princesse Thahidiah Hamen n'ont pas pu être légalement cédés, parcequ'ils sont hypothéqués en faveur de quelques créanciers qui sont actuellement absents, et la cession légale est subordonnée à leur présence. En foi de quoi j'adresse la présente lettre portant l'état des immeubles à Votre Excellence pour son information.

Dimanche, le 1^{er} Zihadeh, 1295.

Le Cadi du Caire,

ABDEL RAHMAN DAFIZ.

Seal.

This letter has been legalized by the Chef de Division, Ministry of Justice, and by NUBAR PASHA, and proves that all the formalities required by Mussulman law for the cession of the property have been complied with, and that the Government are the legal proprietors of the whole of the property, with the exception of the 9,591 feddans mentioned in the letter as being mortgaged, the legal cession of which is subordinate to the presence of the creditors.

All revenue received from the Commissioners in excess of what may be required for interest will be applied in the redemption of the Bonds. The proceeds of any lands which may be sold by the Commissioners are also to be remitted to Messrs. ROTHSCHILD in London to be applied solely in the redemption of the Bonds. The Bonds will be redeemed by purchase if under par, otherwise by drawings at par.

NEW COURT, 8th November, 1878.

FORM OF APPLICATION.

EGYPTIAN STATE-DOMAIN MORTGAGE BONDS.

Issue of £8,500,000 (Eight Million Five Hundred Thousand Pounds Sterling) nominal Capital 5 per Cent. Bonds.

To MESSRS. N. M. ROTHSCHILD & SONS,
GENTLEMEN,

I request that you will allot to £ say Pounds nominal Capital of the above Stock, on which enclose the required deposit of five per Cent., or £ , and agree to accept that amount, or any less sum that may be allotted to and to pay the balance of such allotment according to the conditions of your Prospectus of the 8th November, 1878.

GENTLEMEN,

Your obedient Servant,

Name at length.....
Address
.....
London, November, 1878.

HYDE-PARK.

Valuable Leasehold Family Residence, having a coach house and stable, and held at almost a nominal ground-rent, with the advantage of possession for occupation.—By order of the Executors of the late Mrs. Jane Caroline Walker.

MESSRS. NEWBON & HARDING will **SELL** by **AUCTION**, at the **MART**, on **THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14**, at **TWO** precisely, the superior **LEASEHOLD RESIDENCE**, No. 13, Westbourne-street, a most desirable position in close proximity to Hyde-park, a few doors only from Baywater-road, and a few minutes' walk from Finsbury-street Station and the Great Western Terminus, containing ten bed and dressing rooms, handsome double drawing room extending from back to front, dining room, library, and the usual domestic offices; and in the rear, and communicating, a double coach house and three-stall stable with living rooms and loft over, being No. 3, Bathurst-mews; the whole with possession, and of the estimated rental value of £300 per annum. Term 54½ years unexpired, at the almost nominal ground-rent of £10.

May be viewed by cards, to be obtained of the Auctioneers. Particulars had at the Mart; of

Messrs. **BOOTH & BAYLIFFE**, Solicitors, 1, Raymond-buildings, Gray's-inn, W.C.; and of the Auctioneers, 5, Church-row (now 313, Upper-street), Islington, N.

Policies of Assurance, in a well-known and old-established Office, for Sale, viz., a Policy for £500 effected with the Great Britain Mutual Life Assurance, and Two for £250, each effected with the same office, all three being on the life of a gentleman now aged 55.

M. R. P. STATHAM HOBSON will **SELL** the above by **AUCTION**, at the **MART**, on **WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 13**, at **TWO** o'clock precisely.

Particulars may be obtained of **SAMUEL EVANS, Esq.**, 98, London-wall, E.C.; at the Mart, E.C., and at the Auction Offices, 30, Coleman-street, Bank.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON & FARMER'S LIST OF ESTATES AND HOUSES to be SOLD or LET, including Landed Estates, Town and Country Residences, Hunting and Shooting Quarters, Farms, Ground Rents, Rent Charges, House Property and Investments generally, is published on the first day of each month, and may be obtained, free of charge, at their offices, 80, Cheapside, E.C., or will be sent by post in return for two stamps.—Particulars for insertion should be received not later than four days previous to the end of the preceding month.

THE AGRA BANK (LIMITED).

Established in 1833.—Capital, £1,000,000.
HEAD OFFICE—NICHOLAS-LANE, LOMBARD-STREET, LONDON.
BRANCHES in Edinburgh, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kurrachee, Agra, Lahore, Shanghai, Hong Kong.

CURRENT ACCOUNTS are kept at the Head Office on the terms customary with London bankers, and interest allowed when the credit balance does not fall below £100.

Deposits received for fixed periods on the following terms, viz. :—At 5 per cent. per annum, subject to 13 months' notice of withdrawal. For shorter periods deposits will be received on terms to be agreed upon.

Bills issued at the current exchange of the day on any of the Branches of the Bank free of extra charge; and approved bills purchased or sent for collection.

SALES AND PURCHASES effected in British and foreign securities, in East India Stock and loans, and the safe custody of the same undertaken.

Interest drawn and army, navy, and civil pay and pensions realized. Every other description of banking business and money agency, British and Indian transacted. **J. THOMSON, Chairman**

WANTED, by Man and Wife, care of Offices or Chambers. Wife very good Cook and Housekeeper. Husband employed during the day. Would sleep on the premises. Own furniture if required. Ages 40 and 36. No family. Good testimonials and references.—B. W., 164, Stamford-street, Blackfriars.

OFFICES or CHAMBERS to be Let in newly-erected premises close to Chancery-lane. Three good rooms, third floor, rent £45; second floor, three rooms, £45; ditto, ditto, £50.—Apply to Messrs. BRAY, WESS, & HARWOOD, Auctioneers, 14, Warwick-court, High Holborn, W.C.

OFFICES to be LET, with Fire Proof Rooms SAVOY HOUSE, approach to the Embankment, fitted with every convenience, suitable for Solicitors, Architects, &c.—Apply to Mr. KINGSLEY, 37, Essex-street, Strand; Gso. REES, 115, Strand, nearly opposite Exeter Hall.

MODEL SET of OFFICES, No. 7, Fenchurch-buildings, close to Mark and Mincing-lanes, just built, self-contained, and suitable for a firm of solicitors or a mercantile firm. Strong room, lavatories, private W.C.'s for members of the firm, and other conveniences not found in large blocks of buildings.—Messrs. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, & FARMER, 80, Cheapside, E.C.

To BARRISTERS, SOLICITORS, and OTHERS.

CAUSE LISTS and all other **OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS** for the **CHANCERY, COMMON LAW, PROBATE and ADMIRALTY DIVISIONS** are supplied to Subscribers at £2 5s. per Annum.—Publishing Office, 1, Warwick-court, Holborn (opposite Chancery-lane).

The Companies Acts, 1862 & 1867.

Every requisite under the above Acts supplied on the shortest notice.

The **BOOKS** and **FORMS** kept in stock for immediate use **MEMORANDA** and **ARTICLES OF ASSOCIATION** speedily printed in the proper form for registration and distribution: **SHARE CERTIFICATES, DEBENTURES, &c.**, engraved and printed. **OFFICIAL SEALS** designed and executed. No charge for sketches. Companies Fee Stamps Railway Registration Forms.

Solicitors' Account Books.**RICHARD FLINT & CO.**

(Late ASH & FLINT), Stationers, Printers, Engravers, Registration Agents, &c., 49, Fleet street, London, E.C. (corner of Serjeants'-inn). Annual and other Returns Stamped and Filed.

LAW COPYING OFFICE.

75, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON, W.C.

NO CHARGE FOR PAPER.

DOCUMENTS COPIED 1d. per folio. Engrossed 2d. per folio.

PLANS COPIED.

LAW and GENERAL PRINTING.

LAW and GENERAL LITHOGRAPHY.

LAW and GENERAL STATIONERY.

PARCHMENT.—Indentures ruled and red lined for 15, 20, and 30 folios, 24s. dozen; Followers, 22s. dozen.

ACCOUNT BOOKS of Every Description.

DIE SINKING and STAMPING.

COPYING and LEVER PRESSES.

EDWARD TANN,

75, CHANCERY LANE, & 308, HIGH HOLBORN.

Samples forwarded. Estimates given.

£ 1 0 0 R E W A R D.

TO STEEL PEN MAKERS, STEEL PEN DIE CUTTERS, AND STAMPERS, AND DEALERS IN STEEL PENS.

If having come to our knowledge that imitations of our Pens are being manufactured and sold, we are prepared to pay the above amount for such information as may be sufficient to ensure the conviction of any person making, in violation of our rights, imitations of our Steel Pens, stamped with any of the undermentioned names or titles, or colourable imitations of the same:—

THE WAYERLEY PEN.
THE PICKWICK PEN.
THE HINDOO PEN.

THE OWL PEN.
THE NILE PEN.
THE PANTON PEN.

Or our Name—MACHINES & CAMERON.

Communications, which will be treated as in strict confidence, may be addressed to J. P. MANN, JUN., Solicitor, 37, Essex-street, Strand, London; or to our firm,

M A C N I V E N & C A M E R O N (Established 1778),

Penmakers to Her Majesty's Government Offices,

23—33, BLAIR-STREET, EDINBURGH,

The Registered Proprietors.

Dated this 2nd Sept., 1878.

MILNERS' SAFES for Deeds, from £4 8s. to £11 11s.

MILNERS' SAFES for Jewellery, from £7 10s. to £20.

MILNERS' SAFES for Plate, from £19 5s. to £90.

MILNERS' SAFES for Books and Documents, from £5 15s. to £93 10s.

MILNERS' SAFES for Lawyers, from £8 10s. to £65 10s.

MILNERS' SAFES for Jewellers, from £13s. 4s. to £246 2s. 6d.

MILNERS' SAFES for Bankers, from £33 11s. to £502 10s.

MILNERS' SAFE COMPANY (Limited), Liverpool, London: Milners'-buildings (opposite Moorgate-street Station), City, E.C. Manchester: 98, Market-street.

DINNEFORD'S MAGNESIA.

The Medical Profession for over Forty Years have approved of this pure solution as the best remedy for

ACIDITY of the STOMACH, HEARTBURN, HEADACHE, COXT and INDIGESTION.

And as the safest Aperient for Delicate Constitutions, Ladies, Children, and Infants.

DINNEFORD'S MAGNESIA.